

CG

THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D.

OCTOBER 1958

Contributors Include

AUTHORITY

D. SHERWIN BAILEY, A.C.I.I., PH.D.
RUPERT E. DAVIES, M.A., B.D.
L. W. GRENSTED, M.A., D.D.
D. ALAN KEIGHLEY, M.A., B.D.
G. W. H. LAMPE, M.A., D.D.
A. MARCUS WARD, M.A., D.D.

FRANK BAKER, B.A., B.D., PH.D.
DONALD J. BOYS, B.D., PH.D.
G. THOMPSON BRAKE
R. NEWTON FLEW, M.A., D.D.
JOHN FOSTER, M.A., D.D.
DEREK STANFORD, F.R.S.L.
WESLEY F. SWIFT



THE EPWORTH PRESS
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY [FRANK H. CUMBERS]

25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1
OCT 20 1958

Four Shillings and Sixpence Net
LIBRARY

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW
is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	241	St Alban by John Foster, M.A., D.D.	278
The Psychology of Authority by L. W. Grensted, M.A., D.D.	243	The Samaritans and Their Liturgy by Donald J. Boys, B.D., PH.D.	283
The Authority of Jesus Christ by A. Marcus Ward, M.A., D.D.	247	The Divine Image in Dylan Thomas by Derek Stanford	287
Authority in Bible, Church and Reason by G. W. H. Lampe, M.A., D.D.	252	<i>The Whole Duty of Man</i> by G. Thompson Brake	293
Authority of Preacher, Teacher, and Pastor by Rupert E. Davies, M.A., B.D.	257	John Wesley's Lectionary by Wesley F. Swift	298
Authority in Politics by D. Alan Keighley, M.A., B.D.	262	Recent Literature Edited by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	305
Authority in the Family by D. Sherwin Bailey, A.C.I.I., PH.D.	266	From My New Shelf by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	314
'Mad Grimshaw' and His Covenants with God (2) by Frank Baker, B.A., B.D., PH.D.	271	Our Contributors	Inside Back Cover

THEIR SECURITY DEPENDS ON YOU!

- ★ The security of a happy home is the right of every child.
- ★ Our family purse must ever grow to meet the increasing needs of all our children and to help us to take more needy girls and boys into our care.
- ★ The League of Light helps to keep our income regular. All members have to do is to promise to give or collect 10/6, which is only 2½d. a week. An attractive lantern box is provided.
- ★ Please let us send you fuller particulars, write to:

THE PRINCIPAL, REV. J. W. WATERHOUSE, M.A., B.D.

National Children's Home

Chief Offices: Highbury Park, London, N.5

W
on-
35,

278

283

287

293

298

305

314

ver



Editorial Comments

AUTHORITY

THE QUESTION of authority is one which constantly arises both for individuals and institutions. Every individual is in some way subject to various authorities, such as government, trades union, employer, and Church, and has to decide not only how far their commands are to be accepted or rejected, but, in the case of conflict between them, which has the first claim. He is also himself a person in authority, perhaps as an expert in some subject, as a superior in business, as a holder of some official position, or as a parent, and he is faced with the problem of deciding how and to what extent that authority should be used. Institutions such as family, government, and Church are faced with similar questions: how should authority be used, what matters should it control, how far should it go, how long should it be exercised, and how is it related to the freedom of the individual and the authority of other institutions? Questions like these also lie behind many of the difficulties of international affairs and Church relations. It is very necessary that we should try to think our way through the problems involved, and the writers of the articles which follow have been invited to set out some of the principles upon which we must act.

Authority is of various kinds. There is the authority of power, that of being able (either by one's self or with the support of others whom one controls or represents) to compel obedience by main force. There is the authority of prestige, that which belongs to the holder of some high office or of some qualification which is deserving of respect. There is the authority of custom, that of being used to being obeyed. There is the authority of character, that attaining to a person who is believed to be reliable in knowledge, judgement, and moral nature. And there is the authority of truth, that which is so evidently right that it cannot but be accepted. These various kinds of authority may, of course, be combined, so that one obeys a policeman, for example, because of the authority of power, prestige, and custom, and one accepts the judgement of a lecturer because of the authority of prestige, character, and truth.

All these kinds of authority have a proper place. That of truth is primary and cannot be ignored, for even if with one's conscious mind one is determined not to accept it, it penetrates the subconscious and lives on in the personality as a fire which one cannot extinguish. The authority of personality is indispensable, because it is not possible for every individual to work out all the details of knowledge and wisdom for himself, and he must accept a very large number of things on the word of others. The authority of custom is necessary in all kinds of practical situations; we cannot do without the automatic response to a man in uniform who is controlling the traffic or the doctor who says, 'Drink this!' The authority of prestige cannot be dispensed with in the chairman who says, 'I rule that out of order,' or the plumber who says, 'What this wants is a new washer,' or the teacher of art who says, 'If you build your picture like that it will look wrong.' The authority of power as a permanent or isolated authority is unsatisfactory; but it can very properly secure right action from people who refuse to accept the other kinds of authority, and it is valuable as a temporary

measure over those whose recognition of those other kinds of authority needs time to develop. It is of course the kind of authority which can most easily be abused, but fortunately it is very far from being all-powerful, for it has no control over the mind, and even bodily obedience can be refused by those who are prepared to die rather than conform.

All authority, as the following articles unite in saying, is of God. That of rulers, parents, teachers, scientists, artists, preachers lies in the fact that through them God speaks His truth and utters His commands. Yet because they are all imperfect receivers of His word they do not always understand it themselves or deliver it aright to others. They are therefore to be followed and believed only in so far as they speak His word. As Charles Wesley says,

*I dare not hastily believe,
I dare not aught unproved receive,
Nor follow men before I see
How far my leader follows Thee.*

The ultimate appeal, therefore, is to individual judgement (whether in deciding for one's self what is true or in deciding what other authority to follow). But this also is notoriously an imperfect receiver of the word of God. We are all ignorant, dull, warped by sin and hindered by environment, and therefore we very often do not hear aright. God is the infallible authority, but no one infallibly hears His word—neither rulers, nor saints, nor experts, nor the writers of the Bible, nor those who sit in the courts of the Church. There is no infallible medium through which He can speak.

This is not something to be lamented. What it means is that the world which God has provided for us is one in which His word must be sought by thought, by experiment, by sometimes following men and sometimes leading them, by judging for ourselves both about the truth we can see and the subsidiary authorities we can trust, by being humble enough to acknowledge and learn from errors, and by so trusting in God that we can risk making mistakes, accept opposition, and frequently live in what Charles Wesley calls 'calm uncertainty'. It is, in fact, not a world designed to produce obedient automatons, but intelligent, courageous, free, enterprising, humble, and loving children of God.

A
this
may
the
dele
a St
thor
pers
mon
Eve
secu
back
or is
be a
usu
rest
was
and
olde
hist
in i
deg
deg
or t
Ne
T
wh
in v
sup
the
doc
of t
the
dea
gro
com
But
a s
soc
mo
div
litt
to

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF AUTHORITY

AUTHORITY is a topic usually discussed in terms of political or social science. As the derivation of the word shows, it is concerned with a right, in this political or social sense, to be the author or originator of action. This right may be inherent, or assumed to be inherent, as in the case of a father managing the affairs of his family and controlling the pattern of its life. Or it may be delegated from some higher source of authority, as in the officers through which a State makes effective its corporate will. In either case the conception of authority is closely bound up with the conceptions of power and freedom, for the person acting authoritatively normally feels that he is exercising power, and is more than apt to enjoy that exercise with the sense of superiority which it entails. Even a directly delegated authority carries with it this feeling of power, rendered secure from threats and immune from criticism by the higher authority in the background. And if that higher authority is not easily identified and understood, or is even shadowy and unreal, its value in reinforcing a delegated authority may be all the greater, even if that delegation is unreal and the true source of power is usurpation by force. The great achievements of the Roman imperial system rested upon the invaluable fictions that the emperor, as tribune of the people, was a truly democratic representative of their wishes and that, in issuing coinage and in many other ways, he acted by decree of the Senate, and so inherited the oldest and strongest tradition of Roman administration. But his real power, as history made abundantly plain, lay in his control of the army and, ultimately, in its loyalty. His power, naturally enough, carried with it a corresponding degree of freedom, even when, as in some of the Roman emperors, that freedom degenerated into an extravagance of licence quite unrelated either to the fictional or to the real sources of their authority. When this happened, as in the case of Nero, authority broke down, with disaster alike to its holder and to the State.

This same correlation of power and freedom appears even more strongly where the authority is felt as inherent, for here the right passes beyond the sphere in which it can be challenged. It was a perfectly natural development which supplemented the true sources of authority in rulers by the supreme fictions of the deification, even in their lifetime, of the Roman emperors and by the later doctrine of the divine right of kings. All this was only, on a grand scale, a version of the most absolute and unchallenged authority which ancient Rome ever knew, the *patria potestas*, the right of the father of the family, extending even to life and death, over slaves and sons alike. The modern State, partly on humanitarian grounds and partly in pursuance of its own claim to control and fashion the oncoming generations, has gone far in challenging the absolute rights of fatherhood. But the psychological basis of those rights, rights in which even the mother takes a second place, remains—a source alike of confusion and of strength in the social order of a swiftly changing world. There are, indeed, very many who hold, more or less consciously and explicitly, something very like a doctrine of the divine right of fathers. And this right is often claimed by those who pay all too little attention to its necessary counterpart, the divine obligation upon fathers to act as fathers should.

All this can be, and has been, studied objectively by historians and social

scientists. It is obviously not only possible but important, if the picture is to be complete, to look at it from the psychological side as well. For behaviour can be usefully studied not only as a series of events, things done and observed, but as the feeling of doing them, their inner personal motivation, their emotional and dynamic content, conscious and unconscious. To exercise authority is one thing. But what is this sense, very strange when we come to look at it, of rightness, rightness amounting to compulsion and even obsession, in so doing? Can we, in fact, see our way at all clearly in constructing a Psychology of Authority.

One thing must be noted at the outset. It will be not only a psychology of the exercise of authority but also of submission to authority. For clearly these two are parts of a single whole. An authority exercised is always in some degree an authority accepted. Otherwise authority has been degraded into brute force or even violence. Even a dictator commands some acceptance by his subjects. Therein lies the skill of dictatorship, and perhaps, in some circumstances, its vindication. Our psychological study is at every point two-fold—ruler and subject, civil servant and citizen, teacher and pupil, father and son.

The ultimate problem involved can be stated fairly simply. When we go beyond the almost wholly descriptive accounts given by the social psychologist, ethnologists, anthropologists, and their kind, the only considerable study of the subject is that undertaken by the various schools of analytical psychology, inspired by and developing in some important respects the pioneer work of Freud. Roughly speaking, these derive their theories of authority from the actual conditions under which the human child is born of a mother, developed within a family unit in which the father holds a dominant place, and finally adjusted to membership of various interlocked social groups. The pressure of these successive influences, absorbed consciously and far more strongly unconsciously as the personality or person is formed, is regarded as the basic principle underlying the immense force with which authority is either wielded as a right or accepted as rightful. The whole process, so analysed, seems to be quite independent of what we are accustomed to regard as moral factors. The analysis certainly gives an account, in its own terms, of morality. As such it comes into the field of Moral Philosophy. The question at issue is whether there is anything else in that field, whether in fact the account, the only one which psychology as a science can possibly give, is a complete one. Is there any place for what has been called the natural law? Have right and wrong, good and evil, a status of their own? And, in virtue of that status, must they not be given full consideration when we are trying to understand and interpret the moral development of man. Is there not in fact an authority of morality itself?

This question, demanding an answer, inevitably impels us to ask yet a further question. For, as they stand, morality and the natural law are highly abstract terms. Are we not really seeking, among the grounds of authority in the physical and social relationships of men and women, some ultimate rightness which is more than an abstract principle and which commands our commitment and consent because its source too is personal, in that highest sense of the word which is implied when men, without falling back upon anthropomorphism, speak of a Personal God? Here Moral Philosophy leans for its completeness upon the Philosophy of Religion, a discipline which has its roots in worship and whose values are measured by standards of its own.

With those questions in mind we can turn back to the analytical psychologists and see what they have to say about authority, imposed, and accepted in the development of men and women and in the social patterns which result from that development. The starting point here is Freud's theory of the super-ego, one of the foundation stones of all modern analytical work, a theory which in its broad outlines may fairly be called classical, though indeed it is little over thirty years old. The concept of the super-ego, developed in Freud's *Totem and Taboo* and in his short but fundamental essay, *Group-Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, gathered into itself all the main psycho-analytic hypotheses as to the mechanism of psychical process, developing the vague earlier concept of suggestion into its functions of symbolization, compensation, identification, projection, and introjection. It replaced Freud's earlier hypothesis of the endo-psychic censor, by which he had dramatically explained and illustrated the repressions and distortions which successfully veil the immense significance of dreams and render bearable the tensions which cause them. And it would not be far from the truth to say that in principle it is generally accepted by analytical psychologists, even by those of other schools who do not follow Freud in his mechanistic principles and his determinism, and who do not find his account of the early development of sex in childhood as rigidly scientific or as theoretically important as he and his faithful disciples presuppose.

Broadly speaking, the theory of the super-ego is based upon the dominance of the father, or, more strictly, the masculine characteristics in the parents. To the small child the mother is the source of food, the place of refuge and of the warm comfort of physical contact. The father, as the child gradually becomes aware of him, provides strength and support in the earliest forms of play, and these merge into physical dominance, which soon includes the mother too. The father thus becomes at once a loved and admired source of strength and at the same time an object of primitive jealousy, and this tension increased as the range of the father's dominance comes to include the traditional pattern of family life to which the child must necessarily conform, even when its own jealousy and its growing individuality demand expression. The problem affects boy and girl differently, a fact to which insufficient attention is paid by those who, in demanding the emancipation of women, think that it means equating them in all respects with men, a confusion of thought which has only to be stated clearly for its absurdity to be shewn. But in both boy and girl the solution of the problem is found by the process of introjection and identification. The authoritarian element in the father is taken over into the developing ego of the child, who thus not only becomes his own authority but also, being wholly unaware of the processes by which this is happening, finds within himself an absolute impulsion, impervious to reason, to regard their dictates as carrying their own right. It may be added, to avoid an obvious misunderstanding, that the child who appears to be rebellious against all parental authority and who is so strongly contra-suggestible as to be a nuisance in the home and even a 'problem child' is in fact recognizing this same authority within himself by the very fact of his rebellion against it. It is a well-known phenomenon that such boys and girls, given reasonable opportunity in life's hazards, very usually develop conformity to the original parental tradition in middle life, with variations appropriate to changing social conditions in the greater world. But this healthy development is often

frustrated by parents who, lacking patience and understanding, try to enforce an external conformity to the parental pattern instead of trusting the far more powerful forces of identification and introjection at deep unconscious levels.

For Freud the terms super-ego and ego-ideal mean the same thing, and it is this powerful endo-psychic mechanism which stands, as it were, between the crude animalism of the Id, the 'natural man', and the developing Ego, which is thus enabled to inherit all that is strong and socially valuable in the traditional inheritance of mankind. It is here that its function in the management of our dream-life is explained, and the significance of the dreams finds its explanation with it. In its more conscious aspect it constitutes what we know as conscience, and the tendency of conscience to express itself in negative inhibitions, a 'stop' as the Quakers say, fits readily into the picture.

What is not explained by this Freudian theory is the emergence of higher and higher values. The process as he has described it is true enough, as far as it goes. But it does not explain even the values which Freud himself accepted as final, the social pattern of men living together in a true brotherhood cemented by a love-life which is far removed from the physiology of sex. It appears indeed that what Freud calls the ego-ideal should be strictly speaking separated from the concept of the super-ego, even though it draws upon the super-ego for much of its content and borrows its authority. Side by side with the introjection of the authoritarianism of the father there is a valuation of states and objects as 'good' in their own right. There is an undoubted authority in beauty and a factual authority in truth which are very different in kind from the authoritarianism of the super-ego, and yet which are blended in very varying degrees in that personal pattern which constitutes individuality and which asserts itself with all the force of a right. It is difficult to explain this without the hypothesis of 'good objects', to use a phrase important in the more recent development of Freudian theory by Melanie Klein and Dr W. D. Fairbairn. Primarily the 'good object' is just that which fits neatly into the development process, like the mother's breast. But anybody who has watched the pleasure of the small child in a flower, or a moving play of shadows, or even in good music, has watched the formation of patterns, authoritative though not authoritarian, which transcend the super-ego even while their development is interlocked with it in the processes of growth to adult autonomy.

At this point it is well to remember the more speculative, but far more vital, development of analytical theory by Jung, with his hypothesis of racial determinants of humanity within which, and drawing upon which, the process of individuation, the making of the Self, takes place. In this process all that Freud means by the super-ego can be fitted, as a perfectly true part of the picture; but it is by no means the whole. The development of the ego is not a closed movement, within the limits of the parental setting, but a dynamic reaching out through its four-fold functions of feeling and instinct, intuition and reason, to that which is reaching inwards, seeking incorporation until the ego becomes truly a Self, free, autonomous, carrying its authority within itself.

The supreme value, as this speculation of Jung may serve to remind us, is the value of the person as such, the inchoate person, the person developing in an environment, the person in whom environment and ego, the elements which make up personality or the Self, are made one. But there is no explanation of

this value. It stands in its own right. The simple teaching of Christianity that each individual has his own worth, an absolute worth, seems to be the necessary counterpart to all this picture of psychological development. And that it has worth for us because it has worth for God, who slowly and ever, throughout our childhood and in all our lives, presses that demand of His being upon us, is perhaps after all the simplest and most comprehensible way of saying what is most important in Jung's difficult analysis of the archetypes of the impersonal unconscious, and of completing what is so obviously missing in Freud's account of the super-ego and the ego-ideal.

Here then is the true ground of authority. In individuals it is conscience, and inspiration and vision. In nations and political leaders, in policemen and school-masters, the ground of authority is the same, worked out upon all sorts of scales, twisted by traditions and social customs, distorted by fears, jealousies, ambitions and all the pitiful sinning of man, and yet deriving all that is strongest in it, the ego-ideal which transforms the authority of power into the authority of right, from God.

It was the super-ego, a super-ego delegated, unsure of itself, and frightened, that drove Pilate to use his power to crucify Jesus. It was the ego-ideal, wholly set free in One Man Crucified and risen, that gave Jesus final authority, the authority of God Himself, over the free souls of men. L. W. GRENSTED

THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS CHRIST

FOR THOSE who believe that Jesus Christ is God incarnate He is the final authority. As Lord and Head of the Church, He has absolute authority whether in regard to the right to claim obedience in what we do or as touching the power to influence belief in what we think. But it is easier to give lip service to these unexceptionable propositions than understand what they mean or to put them into practice. What is to be said here is written in the conviction that we must begin with the attempt to understand the nature of the authority behind Jesus' teaching. The conviction has its personal reference. Most men can look back to some event—a sermon, a book, a conversation—which marks a turning point in the understanding of the Gospel. For the writer one such event was hearing Anderson Scott give his Hulsean Lectures in 1928. The light there shed on the meaning of Christ's authority became more luminous under the reading of John Oman's books.¹

It all began very simply with the exposition of Mark 1₂₂: 'And they were astonished at His teaching, for He taught them as one who had authority, and

not as the scribes.' *As one who had authority.* How great a claim for Himself is stated and implied in the narratives of the life He lived so humbly among men. His words and deeds left on the minds of those who knew Him best an impression of unique authority, and this impression they surely communicated. It covers both the manner and the substance of the teaching. Not all who admire, and seek to follow, the content of the Sermon on the Mount sufficiently consider the huge assumptions lying behind it. Jesus is taking on Himself to lay down the conditions for seeing God and becoming His sons. To men who held the law of Moses to be eternal and divine, He proclaims a new law. He offers something better than the righteousness taught by the Prophets. He does so on the authority of His own: 'I say unto you.' He claims to be the One to whom men should come to receive what the Divine Wisdom offered. There are many who honour the substance of the teaching—an ideal of good beyond previous imagining, expressed in a form never since surpassed, and exemplified in a life having in it nothing to amend or improve—but tacitly ignore the claim. We can at least appreciate the insight and honesty of Montefiore, who, commenting on Matthew 11^{25ff}, said: 'We can only hope Jesus never uttered it.' We would rather begin with Nicodemus: 'We know you are a teacher come from God.' The authority derives from the oneness of the Teacher with the Father. No doctrine of Christ's person is complete which does not take account of the teaching, both of its intrinsic truth and wisdom, and of its theological presupposition.

And not as the scribes. The hearers were quick to note that here was a new kind of authority. Short-cuts, though dangerous in the long run, save trouble for the time being, and the shortest way to be sure about anything is to accept the authority of external rules. The scribes had that kind of authority, binding burdens of detailed rules and lying them on men's shoulders. Many were, and are, content to have it so. Jesus found many, ready to accept anything on the authority of others, who were willing to regard Him as rabbi, but He would not deal with them after that manner. He would neither demand the submission men ask for nor impose the rules, from above and without, which they accept. In substituting persuasion for coercion, He related the authority of His teaching to the response of conscience, lest men should renounce their birth-right as children of God. So to display truth as to persuade men to see it to be true for themselves was the motive behind His teaching in parables. We do not regard them aright if we take them simply as illustrations to enforce a point. They are challenges to His hearers to judge for themselves. Such parables led up to the question: What do *you* think? And if no one is so shallow as to find nothing in them, no one is so deep as to exhaust their meaning. Thus the authority of Jesus, high as it was, never intimidated, never denied that in the soul of His hearers. He never says: 'This is true because I say so', but 'You may see this to be true if you will'. The 'I say unto you' of the Son of God is the beginning of discussion, not its closure. Concerning this new persuasive authority we may listen to Oman:²

The great demonstration of the Christ is just that He never sets Himself, as the absolute external authority of the perfect truth, in opposition to the imperfect authority of the finite and sinful spirit within, but that He has only one appeal, which is to the likeness of God and the teaching of God within. Jesus speaks indeed with authority. He

is not as the Scribes. They had authorities but no authority. They had nothing to speak from direct, and nothing to appeal to direct. Jesus, on the other hand, speaks from man to man the truth He has seen and to which His hearers cannot be blind, unless they close their eyes. Exclusively He addresses Himself to the primal spiritual authority in man—the spiritual vision which discerns things spiritual. He is not as the Scribes, precisely because when He failed there, He fell back on no other authority. On the contrary, He was able to exclude every other appeal except the appeal to the spiritual in man. No man accepted the truth from Him for any lower reason than because it had appealed to his heart as true. He had no dignity of place or office with which to impose and no material possession with which to attract. Stripped of all extraneous aid, the truth was left to be its own authority and its own appeal for the hearts made in the image of Him who is true.

Of this the result may be seen in the Little Flock gathered by Jesus in His earthly ministry. His calling won their obedience and constituted their brotherhood. His persuasion directed their lives and governed their conduct. But what of us who live in later days, and in one sense away from His presence, and are often disillusioned by unfruitful attempts to apply Jesus' teaching in situations very different from those faced by the first disciples? So often we seem to need a broader base than that provided by the few months of a long distant public ministry in Galilee and Jerusalem. In our 'post-critical age' many hard questions arise. How much in the Gospel record is literally from Him? How are His words to be regarded as final? The questions take on a sharper edge when we remember that the most conservative among us do, in fact, select among the sayings. And having settled as best we may the problems connected with the journey back from the Gospels to the gospel, we still ask how we are to find the meaning of our 'authority' and apply its underlying principles to the needs of our days?

In attempting to grapple with these difficulties the first thing to be said is that it is possible, and common, to over-estimate them. The Four Gospels may not contain all we would like for our present guidance, but they do give us a coherent body of teaching, and glimpses of Jesus in action, in the most searching and critical circumstances, illustrating and applying that teaching. The manner of His doing so is wholly consistent. Between the teaching and the Teacher in action there is complete coherence. It is often said that what is revealed in the Gospels is a person, and not propositions about a person. It follows that we read the Gospels not to appropriate a series of Christ's commands but to know Christ commanding. And what we are given therein is sufficient for knowledge of Jesus' character and ideas.

Further, in estimating the relation between the gospel event and the records which have come down to us, we may not ignore the impression which He made on His disciples, an impression so unforgettable that when, after the Ascension, they attempted to express the salvation He had wrought they could but communicate the significance of His life and words. The writer recalls impressive testimony to this, in the context of Church Union discussions, as Dr H. W. Gensichen insisted on relating every detail of discussion on authority to the fact of Christ.³

While the Lord was still among His disciples on earth the problem of authority was settled in that unconditional obedience and submission which marked the relationship

of the disciples to their Lord as an irreversible relation of dependence. . . . The first great crisis of this relationship, marked by the cross of Calvary, ends up in its re-appreciation through the resurrection and the events of the following forty days. . . . Just as in the forty days the Old Testament promises appeared as true and fulfilled, now, in this ensuing 'period of the Church', the promises of the forty days appear as true and fulfilled: 'I am with you always, to the close of the age', and, 'You will be my witnesses'. Both the revelation and the obedience are to go on beyond the forty days, though indirectly, yet in no less real way. It is this in direct and yet real continuation of the revelation and of the obedience which is the message of the prophets and apostles as contained in the Scriptures. By virtue of the Lord's promise their Scriptural witness is to represent Jesus Christ, the living Lord for us, as He was the living Lord for them during the forty days.

We may link with this that insight of present-day biblical thinking which stresses that what matters in the New Testament, and is the basis of the power and joy of Christians, is the conviction that in the *Now*, between Ascension and Parousia, there is only one Authority, seated at the right hand of God, and all other authorities are subject to Him. By the cross, He has won the victory over all the unseen hostile powers⁴ and they need no more be feared or served.⁵ There is but one true Lord and He has declared: 'All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me.'⁶ If in the heavenlies, how much more on earth. This was a fact that need not be argued. The *implicit* acceptance of Christ's authority by the first Christians is testimony to its completeness. This is a point which may be developed for the benefit of those who are troubled about the exactness of the transmission of Jesus' words. An illustration comes from the context of *discipline*, the point at which the nature and sanctions of authority are most clearly seen.

Jesus' attitude to the offender is usually thought of in terms of the patience and hope implied in His answer to Peter's question: 'How often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him?'⁷ However, the parable which follows⁸ assumes that the sinner desires to be forgiven. What then, of the harder problem of the one who persists in breaking the harmony of the fellowship and does not wish to be forgiven? Jesus has already dealt with this.⁹ Make every attempt at reconciliation by personal approach, individually or with the help of a few friends. Should these methods fail, bring the offender under the moral pressure of the whole community. If after all this he still refuses to accept the responsibilities of membership, he must be deprived of its privileges and put out of communion. Before the grim sound of *excommunication* leads us to conclude that we reach a point where the authority of persuasion breaks down, we should consider His actual words: *Let him be to you as a Gentile and a tax-collector*, i.e. an outcaste, and so, in Jesus' eyes, a man not to be ostracized but to be won. Here is an authority which knows discipline's proper work to begin at the very point where the privileges of membership have to be withdrawn. Let the sinner go to the far country that he may learn what belonging means and be welcomed back.

From this we may draw two inferences. The first concerns the acceptance of this authority, and its transmission, by the first great interpreter of Jesus. Paul's habit of distinguishing between what he says on the direct authority of the Lord¹⁰ and what he gives as a piece of personal advice¹¹ has tended to obscure the fact that his letters are steeped in the teaching of Jesus. True he rarely

quotes His actual words, but the use of the New Testament with the fuller marginal references discloses the Pauline 'echo' of the larger part of what is given in the Synoptic Gospels. Paul's thought is so saturated with what he has learned of the mind of Christ that he has no need to quote. Thus, how truly does he apply the principle of authority laid down by Jesus when dealing with a flagrant case of immorality at Corinth.¹² Here is a recalcitrant offender whose behaviour is shocking even to the decent pagan, but is being tolerated by the Christian community. Paul bids the Church meet in solemn session, as under Christ, and cast the sinner into the darkness in order that, deprived of protection against fears, he may come to repent and be saved. It would be hard to find a better example of how the first Christians both accepted and applied the authority of Christ.

The second inference is that Christ's authority does not bind a man who has not had a life-changing encounter with Him. A man does not obey Christ if He has never yielded to Him. The faith by which the Christian lives implies whole-hearted surrender to Jesus as Lord and willing obedience to His will. It is an attitude in which the whole personality of the believer is involved—and the whole Christ. It is always a temptation to let action wait on expediency rather than on listening to Him who has the word of eternal life and who has promised His continuing presence and the guidance of His Spirit. It is no less a danger, when listening, to attempt to reduce His teaching to rules rather than, by it, to conform to His life and death.

To accept the authority of Christ in such terms is not to submit to the domination of a body of teaching which must neither be investigated nor intelligently applied, but to receive freedom. Authority and freedom are often set in opposition to one another. Freedom is regarded as exemption from the control of authority. This negative view is most common when men substitute secondary authorities for the one and only primary authority. The Gospel, however, finds the reconciliation of authority and freedom in the liberation of man by Christ to become a self-determining person. The inner freedom of the liberated will is wholly consistent with obedience to the authority of Him whom to serve is to reign, whose service is perfect freedom. Oman brings the matter to conclusion in his account of Christ:¹³

One who only deals with us as the Son of God in so far as He is perfectly the Son of Man. Not far from the throne of Omnipotence, but in the midst of the struggle of earth, He offers Himself to every soul however unadvanced upon the road towards God—if only he is looking in the right direction—to be the lofty end of his lowly beginnings, the steadfast goal of his wavering aims, the large perfection of which his limited nature dimly prophesies. And this succour He offers, not with the annihilating touch of the omnipotence of power, but with the quickening touch of the omnipotence of Love.

MARCUS WARD

¹ Especially *Vision and Authority and Grace and Personality*. Scott's lectures were later published as *An Introduction to the Ethics of the New Testament*. The imagination plays around the conversation of the two colleagues, for there is a deep spiritual link in their writings.

² *Vision and Authority*, p.107.

³ *Unity in Faith and Life*, pp.19f. (Christian Literature Society, Madras.)

⁴ Colossians 1_{20, 25}; Philippians 2_{5ff.}

⁵ Galatians 4_{3, 6}.

⁶ Romans 8_{38f.}; 1 Corinthians 8_{5ff.}; Matthew 28₁₈.

⁷ Matthew 18_{21f.}

⁸ *ibid.*, verses 15ff.

⁹ *ibid.*, verse 12.

¹⁰ 1 Corinthians 7₁₀.

¹¹ 1 Corinthians 5_{1ff.}; cp. 2 Corinthians 2_{5ff.}

¹² *Vision and Authority*, p.116.

¹³ *ibid.*, verses 23ff.

AUTHORITY IN BIBLE, CHURCH AND REASON

THE PROBLEM of authority is undoubtedly one of the most urgent questions confronting Christians at the present time, for the most decisive of the divisions of Christendom today is that which exists between those who seek for certainty in religious truth and believe that they can find it through an infallible authority, and those, on the other hand, who think that faith and doubt must inevitably go together, that the quest for infallibility is illusory, and that God does not reveal Himself except through human instruments which are necessarily liable to ignorance and error.

For those who accept the latter position, authority in religion is ultimately seen to reside in experience—the experience of those who first witnessed to the events in which God revealed Himself (and pre-eminently the event of Christ), the experience of those who, in the course of Christian history, have experientially verified the truth of that witness, and the experience of the present-day believer. Since religious experience is a many-sided thing, and since Christian experience is necessarily social and corporate rather than merely individual, it follows that for those who take this view Christian unity is of vital and fundamental importance. In a broken Christendom the experience of the Christian society is partial, incomplete and distorted, and the individual ‘Churches’ lack the authority which properly belongs to the united fellowship of the whole Church (in the New Testament sense of the word) to which the promise of the Holy Spirit was given to lead it into all the truth.

For the ‘Fundamentalist’, however, Catholic or Protestant, the source of authority lies in an infallible organ of the Holy Spirit, whose deliverances are ultimately independent of human error and ignorance. God, on this view, has provided His people with direct and immediate guidance; the Holy Spirit speaks through the plenary inspiration of the Scriptural writers, and, for Catholic ‘Fundamentalists’, of the infallible Church, divinely guaranteed against error, speaking through the organs of Councils or Pope. The general *consensus fidelium* is of little consequence to those who adopt the latter position. It denotes, not a genuine *consensus* (for the cumulative experience of Christian people is not required for the checking and verifying of the oracles of God revealed directly in Bible and dogma), but rather a common obedience. It is highly desirable, from the ‘Fundamentalist’ standpoint, that the Church at large should profess this common obedience; but the addition of so many more believers to the ‘Fundamentalist’ ranks would add nothing to the validity of the authority that they acknowledge, nor modify in any way the substance of the accepted doctrine. To those who believe that they possess the whole truth in all its essentials, ecumenicity is a secondary consideration; to those who find the root of authority in the common experience of Christian people, unity is of paramount importance. Here is the most fundamental cleavage of outlook in the Christian world today.

The familiar Christian classification of the sources of authority produces a threefold division: the Bible, tradition, and reason. Of these, reason must, in a sense, take precedence, for one must be rationally convinced of the reasonableness of any religious or moral proposition before one accepts it and acts upon it. Even the believer who accepts an infallible authority acts upon an initial persuasion that he is rationally justified in receiving it as authoritative. Reason,

A CHRISTMAS GIFT

*W*HY NOT give your friend a year's subscription to *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*? Just fill in and post the form below; we will send you a tastefully printed greeting-voucher which will bring the magazine to your friend quarter by quarter.

FOR YOUR FRIEND

ORDER FORM

To THE EPWORTH PRESS, 25-35 CITY ROAD, E.C.1
Please send *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review* each quarter for one year to:

Name

Full Address

I enclose a remittance for £1. Please send the voucher to me.

Signed

Address



ho
ar
the
so
of
pr
au
log

eth
tur
sit
to
It
of
bo
lin
pe
me
TH
CH

a
so
no
ma
ass
cat
co
CH
the
the
be
co
ass
it
tes
au
in

CH
to
pa
tiv
the
ex
wi
em
oth

however, in this context, does not mean logical demonstration. Metaphysical argument is no longer a source of ultimate authority in matters of religion, and the Christian does not owe his convictions to the persuasive force of philosophical 'proofs' of theism such as the 'five ways' of St Thomas. The authority of reason means the authority of experience rather than the cogency of a *priori* demonstration. Experience must be, for everyone, the final ground of authority, for it is by religious experience alone, in the last resort, that theological statements, of whatever kind, can be tested and verified.

'Religious experience', in this sense, means that one takes the theological and ethical assertions of other Christians, as recorded in the Bible and in the literature of the Christian Church and as they are encountered in the contemporary situation, and makes them the basis of one's life. It signifies self-commitment to a particular kind of life which these assertions necessarily entail if they are true. It does not mean simply a particular field of experience, isolated from the rest of life, nor a special department of human activity confined within its own narrow boundaries. Religious experience is not, in this context, a technical term for a limited sphere of human interest; it is not to be equated with mystical experience; it is rather the experience of the whole of life, in all its various departments, in the light of certain fundamental theological and moral assumptions. These assumptions, that there is a personal God, that His nature is revealed in Christ, that communication with Him is possible through prayer and worship, that a right relationship towards Him involves certain profound consequences in social and individual behaviour, and so on, are not formally provable. They are not evidently true and logically incontrovertible, like the statements of the mathematician. They have to be tested and verified empirically, and since these assumptions are all-embracing in their scope and their implications, their verification demands no lesser test than that of the adoption of an entire way of life constructed on the hypothesis that they are in fact true. The assertions of Christianity, therefore, have to be put to the test of life lived in accordance with them. This, of course, means a life lived within the community of believers, in the practice of those means of communion with God which the community believes itself to possess, and in the cultivation of the kind of conduct which the community recognizes as binding upon itself in the light of its theological assumptions. 'If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.' The final criterion of religious truth is to be found in the empirical test of whether a life lived in accordance with it 'works' or not. The ultimate authority on which we accept religious assertions as true is our own experience in actual life.

This does not mean that every Christian must test every assertion of Christian doctrine for himself. Religious faith is not merely a subjective attitude to life. Although the assertions of theology have to be appropriated and become part of a total experience in order to be substantiated and accepted as authoritative, it is not true that the Christian creates his own assumptions. He derives them, for the most part, from the experience of others, and the corporate experience of the Christian society. Much of all this he can accept on trust, without having to verify every part of it, once he has decided, as a result of empirical testing, that where he has been able to compare the experience of others with his own he has found it to be true. His beliefs will therefore be

accepted very largely on the authority of others. They will include all those people whom he may encounter who share in a religious attitude to life; and, as in other fields, the greatest degree of credence will be due to the acknowledged expert—the person who, in so far as his thought and practice can be empirically examined and tested, appears to possess unusual spiritual insight and religious understanding. Moreover, since Christianity is essentially a corporate faith and a social way of life, he will be strongly inclined to accept as authoritative the collective experience of the Church as it has been handed down by its accredited experts and embodied in its generally acknowledged formularies, having, as it were, sampled the value of this body of experience for himself in his own life.

This is not to say that every beginner in Christian living is entitled to sit in judgement upon the religious and theological expert. For him to venture to do this would be as absurd as to expect an unskilled novice in the arts of painting or music to criticize the great artists on the basis of nothing more than his own quite inadequate equipment of experience and knowledge. Nevertheless, his own very limited religious experience at any particular stage in its development is the only criterion which he can apply, and it is on this ground that he has to decide who are the experts and whom he is prepared to take as his guide and instructor. It is thus on the basis of one's own very incomplete and inadequate religious experience that one has to decide whether to accept the corporate 'expertness' of the Church, and the individual judgement and counsel of its acknowledged masters of the Christian life, as authoritative in one's own case. In the sense that this choice has to be made by every individual, and that it is the necessary first step, the authority of experience is prior to any other source of authority; but it is only a first step, leading on immediately to the acceptance of the authoritative wisdom of the Church, transmitted through the centuries and expressed in the general mind of its members. Such authority is of great weight; but it is not infallible, and in the light of reason (that is, in the light of experience in the widest sense) its outward expression in formularies, creeds, and systems of doctrine may need to be revised.

Behind the experience of other Christians in the historic fellowship of the Church, there stands the original and unique experience of those who stood close to certain fundamental events which they discerned to be revelatory acts of God, and witnessed to them in the light of their inner conviction. The heart and focus of the revelatory events is the supreme work of God in the birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and the coming of the Spirit. The message of the Bible is thus primarily the testimony of those whose personal experience enabled them to witness to the facts of these central events and to testify their true significance. This testimony is the apostolic tradition, the source and the norm of the whole tradition of the Church of which it is both a part and the determinative origin.

It is due to no accident that the pages of the New Testament, in the Pauline letters, in the speeches recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and in such passages as Luke's prologue to his Gospel, lay such great stress upon the importance of the witness of the apostles. They were the men selected by Jesus to bear witness to the saving events of His life, death, and resurrection. They were specially commissioned by Him in person to bear their testimony, the guarantee

of the Church's original proclamation. In a real sense the apostle is a part of the gospel which he announces, and his authority as a witness is thus unique. It is the experience of those eyewitnesses, commissioned as the interpreters of Christ, upon which the authority of the New Testament rests.

Two questions arise at this point. Is the authority of these Scriptures being made to depend upon human experience rather than divine revelation? This is largely an unreal division of what is really a single whole. If the apostles' understanding of the events that they witnessed was in any way true, then those events were profoundly revelatory of God. They were the direct acts of God in His self-disclosure as the Living God, working out the redemption of His own creation. Yet the events would be revelatory only to those who had the insight to perceive their true character. The act of God, in the sense of the concrete event, and the human perception of its true character, together constitute a divine revelation. They are both integrally necessary to God's self-disclosure, and both are parts or aspects of the same divine action. If God is to reveal Himself in history, there must be both the event in which God's act is perceived, and the enlightenment, by God's further act, of the human understanding to perceive its meaning and experience it as revelation. The witnesses to Christ were inspired; so much is clear, even though their inspiration, God's gift to them of special insight corresponding to the unique events, operated in and through their limited and fallible intellectual and spiritual understanding, and through minds conditioned by the thought and expression of their time.

The second question which arises is how the original apostolic tradition is to be related to the actual New Testament writings. Is the authority of the former really present in the New Testament books, seeing that it may be the case that no single one of them is the work of a member of the original Twelve, and none, except the authentic Pauline letters, by anyone entitled to call himself an apostle in the full sense of the word. We must here remind ourselves that the criterion by which the formation of the Canon was determined was very largely that of apostolicity. It was always recognized that two of the gospels were the work of men who were not themselves apostles, and the apostolic authorship of other works was acknowledged to be doubtful. All the books which the Church came to accept, however, were regarded as authoritative because they contained the deposit of the original apostolic tradition; they were by apostles or men connected with them, and they were recognized as being congruent in their testimony with the rest of the primitive tradition.

Here is the basic authority of the New Testament. In the time of Papias it was still possible to consult the living experience of old men who remembered the apostles and their witness. Somewhat later, Irenaeus and Tertullian urge the importance of the continuity of the official teaching, guaranteed by the succession of bishops in the teaching chairs of the apostolic churches, as a safeguard for the purity and wholeness of the original testimony. The Canon reduces the testimony to a crystallized deposit, as it were, of the oral tradition of the eyewitnesses, and it was acknowledged as binding because it enshrined the apostolic testimony as this was preserved and remembered in the third and fourth quarters of the first century. It is a matter of some importance that the tradition, as embodied in these writings, does not belong to the immediate post-resurrection period. Reflection is necessary for the true understanding of a momentous event,

and the relation of the historic Jesus to the community's experience of the presence of the ascended Christ through the indwelling Spirit had to be thought out in the context of the Church's life and worship. The Fourth Gospel affords a clearer and more intelligible picture of the meaning of the events of Christ's life, death, and resurrection than any of the apostles could, so far as we can tell, have been able to give at the time.

The authority of the Old Testament for the Christian is derived from the fact that the work of Christ is continuous with it; that the events and hopes recorded there are the setting and prelude without which Christ would be unintelligible. They are integrally bound up with God's acts in Christ, and here again we find the combination of revelatory event and inspired interpretation. The early Church was right in seeing the witness of apostles and prophets as being essentially one and the same, distinguished only as foreshadowing from fulfilment.

The Bible, as the seat of authority, in which men witness to God's Word, is part of the Church's tradition. It is, however, a part which differs decisively from all that follows. The primitive experience, the subject of the apostolic testimony, is given once and for all, and cannot be repeated. The subsequent experience of Christians in the Church verifies the original experience as it is appropriated and as succeeding generations enter into it; the meaning of the original deposit is progressively unfolded and sometimes clarified. But it cannot be added to, or subtracted from, by the later stream of tradition. This is concerned with the preservation and explication of the original message. It cannot judge that message, though it can and must safeguard it, so far as is possible, against misinterpretation. Thus the Church of the Fathers sought to preserve the apostolic tradition from heretical accretions and to clarify its implications, as it did for example in the creed of Nicaea. It is always the original testimony which stands over, and judges, the subsequent tradition, and when that tradition has obscured some essential part of the original Christian experience, as it did in the pre-Reformation Church in respect of justification, for example, the appeal has always to be made from the authority of the Church to that of Scripture.

These authorities, however, should not be set over against each other. Ideally, they are one and the same. The Church's authority, in its corporate statements and in the *consensus fidelium*, as well as in its day-to-day ministry, echoes and explains the sense of Scripture, where it recognizes the authoritative testimony of the unique experience of apostles and prophets. The Church has to correct misunderstandings of Scripture on the part of individuals, and interpret the Scriptures to them; the Scriptures have to be appealed to in order to correct the Church's corporate misunderstandings and perversions of the original testimony; and for each individual there remains the test of Bible and Church in the light of his own experience, echoing and reaffirming in its humbler degree, but under the same guidance of the Spirit, the truth mediated through those greater authorities.

G. W. H. LAMPE

AUTHORITY OF PREACHER, TEACHER, AND PASTOR

I AM THE Truth. This is the claim for Jesus Christ that the Church makes by its very existence, and every Christian accepts by being a Christian. The Truth which is here identified with Jesus is not the truth which may (or may not) be granted to the scientific or metaphysical enquirer if he pursues the methods of enquiry proper to his subject. It is the Truth made finally and definitively known by God Himself. In the past men have 'sought after Him, if haply they might find Him', and their quest has not been fruitless; but now the Truth has been revealed, and men have no longer to grope in the darkness. 'The true light now shineth'; 'ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free'. God has spoken His Truth in Jesus Christ. Argument and speculation are no longer in place. Men have only to listen and obey. By painful reasoning a man might find his way to belief in the existence of God; but he need no longer tread that path. For the Truth has come in person. The implications of that Truth for thought and life still need to be worked out, and that is the proper business of the theologian; the consonance of that Truth with the other objects of human knowledge still needs to be worked out, and worked out not least in our age, and that is the proper business of apologetics. But the basic Truth is already manifested, and the first thing to do is accept it and appropriate it.

The prophets of Israel spoke the Word of God; or rather, God spoke through them to His People, and still speaks through them to us. The Word of God spoken through them did not 'return to Him void'. It 'accomplished that to which He sent it'. Of course, the historical environment of each prophet affected both the form and the content of his message; still more, no doubt, the personal character and temperament, the mental ability and the spiritual discernment, the mastery of words and the power of expression, that each prophet possessed, restricted or facilitated the passage of the Word of God from God to mankind. But in the last resort it was the Word of God that counted for the men of Israel, and still counts for us—not the personality of the prophet, however interesting it may be. That is why it does not matter for our souls' salvation whether there were one, two, three or more Isaiahs, though it is a very fascinating historical and literary problem. The prophets spoke the Word of God—that was their function. But their authority is not to be compared with that of Jesus Christ. For Jesus Christ *was* the Word of God. He also spoke the Word of God, and His teaching fulfils and transcends the Law of Moses and the message of the prophets. But it is not fundamentally His words to which we look for the Truth; we look to Him. It is because He was what He was that He spoke the words of eternal life. His Person, His words, His deeds, His Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, His living presence in His Church, are one; and in Him are 'all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge'.

To Him the Apostles were witnesses. They bore testimony to the things He said, to the things He did, and supremely to the things He suffered and to His victory over death. Their message, from this point of view, was about His 'mighty acts'. But primarily their message was Christ Himself, the Lord. As in the case of the Hebrew prophets, it did not greatly matter who proclaimed the

message, except that the apostles had received their commission directly from the Lord Himself; what mattered was that Christ was proclaimed, for He was Himself the message. We may never know who wrote the Fourth Gospel, though no doubt many theories will be spun by many scholars. But the important question about the Fourth Gospel, or any book of the New Testament, is not, 'Who wrote it?', but 'Is Christ here proclaimed?' The value of the New Testament in every age is primarily that it is the principal witness to Christ, a witness with which we cannot possibly dispense. It is the preaching of the Apostles, their witness to Christ, written down for us to read. But the authority of the Apostles' *kerygma*, either in its spoken or in its written form, is not on the same level as the authority of Him to whom the apostles bore witness. He alone is supremely authoritative.

The Holy Spirit is the 'Spirit of Truth'. He 'will guide us into all the Truth'. The Truth into which he will guide us is Christ; He will not lead us beyond Christ into some imagined higher level of understanding. He will lead us into the fullness of Christ, which is the fullness of Truth. For Christ says of Him: 'He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you.' The task of the Spirit is not to speak of Himself, still less to draw attention to Himself (that is, no doubt, why books on the Holy Spirit are hard to write, and not always, when written, illuminating); His task is to witness to Christ and to draw attention to Him. To this end He inspired the prophets of the Old Covenant, so that the Word of God was spoken through them to prepare men for the coming of Jesus Christ. To this end also He brought to the remembrance of the Apostles all that Christ had spoken to them, and quickened the understanding of those who wrote down the preaching of the apostles and communicated by letter the doctrine and ethics of the Gospel to the early converts. The Holy Spirit brings men to Christ, and convinces them of the Truth which He is.

The authority of the preacher today is clearly derived from his relationship to Jesus Christ, to the Holy Spirit, and to the writers of the Old and New Testaments. He has no authority residing in himself. We cannot, of course, rule out the possibility that God may raise up a prophet among us who will speak to us the Word of God as it has never been spoken before—who will have a direct word from God Himself. But if such a prophet were to appear, he would not carry us beyond Christ; he would still bear witness to Christ, and his relationship to Christ and the Holy Spirit would be all-important, even if he could dispense with the medium of Holy Scripture. We cannot indeed rule out the possibility of this; but there is no evidence that it has ever happened yet, and if it did happen we should need a vast amount of evidence to persuade us that it had; those who have claimed such prophetic authority have done great harm to the Church in the past. Meanwhile, the preacher will do well to tell himself first, last and always that his authority is derivative.

Wesley told his helpers that they had nothing to do but to save souls; and by this he surely meant the basic truth that a preacher's task is essentially that of witnessing to Christ and bringing men and women to Christ. If he does that, he is a preacher; if he does not do that, he is not a preacher, however great his oratorical gifts and his persuasive powers. If he is to witness to Christ, plainly no authority attaches to him as such or to his words as such; all authority belongs to Christ to whom he witnesses, to Christ proclaimed in his words. As with the

Old Testament prophets and the New Testament writers, it does not, in the last resort, matter who the preacher is, but only whether the Word of God is preached and Christ is made known. Of course, the preacher's natural and cultivated gifts will affect the form and content of the message; and the Spirit calls to the task those best fitted to perform it, and the Church trains them to perform it fitly. But the authority of the preacher is only that which is imparted to him by Christ, the living, personal Subject of his sermon. He is the 'servant of the Word', and the Word is Christ. And if he is to bring men and women to Christ, he can do this only by the power of the Holy Spirit, the 'Spirit of convincing speech'; without this all that the preacher can do is to bring men and women to himself, which is not the object, though it is sometimes the unfortunate by-product, of Christian preaching. Clearly then he must subordinate himself to the authority of the Spirit, and speak only what the Spirit bids him speak. That, indeed, is not always easy to ascertain, as one may sometimes gather from the sermons that are actually preached; yet no man is a Christian preacher unless he subjects himself to the searching discipline of the Spirit of Truth.

Now Christ and the Holy Spirit speak to the preacher, and through the preacher to the congregation, largely (though not wholly) by means of the Scriptures. The preacher brings men and women to Jesus Christ through the medium of the Holy Scriptures. He does not simply read or repeat the Scriptures, though the presence of Old and New Testament Lessons in every well-ordered service reminds both congregation and preacher—or should do—that the words of Scripture stand by themselves without the support of our exegesis, and that a service of worship may be complete without a sermon, but not without the reading of Scripture. The preacher expounds the Scriptures, in order that their meaning may be plain, and that their eternal truth may be seen to be contemporary and be applied to the contemporary situation. But the Scriptures are the norm of the sermon. For this to be so, the Old Testament must be expounded in the light of Jesus Christ. We take a text from Deuteronomy, for instance, not chiefly to see what the author meant and apply it at once to the needs of men today, though the explanation of the original meaning may be an effective introduction to what we really want to say. We are chiefly concerned to bring home the message that Deuteronomy has for us when it is fulfilled and given new meaning by Jesus Christ. The New Testament is to be expounded directly, because it points at once to Jesus Christ, and to apprehend its meaning, however dimly, is to come into His presence. Thus the authority of the preacher is derived, not only from Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, but also below them from Holy Scripture. He is not a *mere* intermediary between the Scripture and the congregation; for his mind and imagination must be highly trained if he is to have any chance of speaking to the actual condition of men and women, his character and personality must be such as to 'commend his Saviour', and above all, his powers of expression must be sufficient to convey his message in the language and thought-forms of his hearers. But he is an intermediary, and the moment he steps out of this function he becomes just another would-be expert on modern problems.

The authority of the preacher's message is thus derived from Jesus Christ from the Holy Spirit and from the Scriptures, and woe betide him if he sets himself on the same level with any of them. Yet the tale of those to whom he

must subject himself is not yet told. He needs not only the authority that we have described; he needs also the authorization of the Church. No man may arrogate to himself the office of preacher, however sure he is of a divine call; for Christendom knows to its cost that the strong consciousness of a divine call does not by itself prove the divinity of the call. A preacher is called by Christ Himself, empowered by the Holy Spirit, instructed in the Scriptures—and then authorized, accredited, by the Church. Christ chooses His preachers; the Church acknowledges His choice. Lest this seem to claim for the Church a place equal to that of Christ Himself, we do well to remember that the promise that the Holy Spirit will guide us into all the truth was made to the Church as well as to individuals, and in this matter, of all matters, the Church may surely count on the Spirit's guidance. Only those who have an authoritarian conception of the Church will wish to scrutinize all the utterances of all the preachers whom the Church authorizes; the Church only sets limits which he may not transgress while he retains its authorization. But his authorization comes from the Church.

Thus the authority of the preacher is seen to be highly derivative. Yet although he speaks only on the authority of his 'superiors', he speaks as their representative, as their official spokesman. Though we may truly, and ruefully, be aware of 'the foolishness of the preaching', yet 'it pleased God through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe'. The preacher is the living representative of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, of the Scriptures and of the Church, to sinful, ignorant mankind. If he fails to speak, the voice of Christ will not be heard, the works of Christ will not be known, the power of Christ will not be experienced. The words, the works, the power of Christ are in his mind and on his lips; the living Christ speaks through him, and the Holy Spirit moves his hearers to listen and obey. Every preacher who has any kind of self-knowledge—and self-knowledge is an urgent requirement of every preacher—knows how far short he falls of preaching Christ as He truly is; yet he is called to preach nonetheless. 'How shall they hear without a preacher?' And those who listen to the sermon must listen for the Word of God. It may indeed be heavily disguised, or outrageously distorted; but the preacher is there to preach the Word, and the Word can sometimes come home to men through the most ill-equipped preacher. The power of the Word to reach men's hearts is no excuse for the half-preparation of sermons or for failure to read the books which will throw light on the Scriptures; but the badness of sermons is no excuse for not listening to the Word of God.

It has become customary in Protestant circles to rate the office of preacher higher than that of teacher. This is contrary to the tradition of Judaism and to the practice of the Christian Church in most ages of its history. Nor is it borne out by the New Testament. Jesus was both preacher and teacher—indeed, perhaps teacher rather than preacher. When St Paul gives his lists of those who have received the special gifts of the Spirit, he always includes teachers, and does not seem to allot them a place inferior to that of prophets and evangelists. But the great revivals of history have been the result of preaching rather than teaching, and we tend to infer from this that preachers have somehow a higher status. This is surely a wrong inference. Is it not truer to say that at all times God raises up both preachers and teachers, and that at some times the preacher

has the greater task, at others the teacher? In 'the beginning of the Gospel' the preacher was for a time all-important, and again at the Reformation, and again in the eighteenth century; but in the Middle Ages, and in the seventeenth century, the teacher took his place. In our times it is hard to give to either a predominant position. On the one hand, no one denies the need for revival, and revival usually comes by preaching; on the other hand, the audience of the preacher is greatly diminished, while in schools and universities the teacher of the faith has a great and growing field of activity. In practice, also, most preachers of our time, both in the pulpit and on the radio, mingle their preaching with their teaching, and the teaching sermon is indispensable for the ill-instructed congregations of most churches.

But the teacher and the preacher differ in method, not in authority. The teacher's authority is from Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Bible. His authorization is, or should be, from the Church. The preacher proclaims, and his proclamation is aided by the power which belongs to a considered, solemn, authoritative utterance. The teacher converses with his hearers, makes sure that they understand, and elicits their response; and his efforts are aided by the conscious and active co-operation of those who are in front of him. Each method has its dangers. The preacher is prone to over-dogmatism and prolixity; the teacher to undue reliance on the experts and excessive concentration on detail. But these are the faults of their qualities, and God uses both to make known His Truth and point men to Christ.

At first sight it would seem that the function of the pastor is quite distinct from that of the preacher and the teacher, even when it is exercised by the same person. It is true that the pastor, in his cure of souls, must spend a great deal of his time and energy and skill in reaching the heart of a delicate personal problem, in discovering a man's real needs and anxieties behind the façade of orthodoxy or agnosticism which he shows to the world, in healing the wounds made by misunderstanding and bitterness; he is concerned with analysis, diagnosis and therapy, rather than with proclamation or instruction. He is not addressing a congregation or a class, but an individual person; not uttering large truths, but dealing with the actual situation of someone who trusts him or has come to him in great distress. Very often his chief task may be to listen rather than to speak. Yet if we say only this about the Christian pastor, we are equating him with a doctor or a wise family friend; and doctors and family friends may well be better at giving good advice than the Christian pastor. He must, of course, advise as well as he can by the grace of God and the training which he has received. But he is more than the doctor or family friend; he is there to mediate the grace and truth of God to the sick soul, whether the sickness be in the mind or the spirit or the body. There is a tendency in our time for the pastor's office to be handed over to the psychiatrist; but the psychiatrist, so far at least as his equipment and special knowledge are concerned (though his personal convictions and methods may take him much further), works within the range of human knowledge and resources. The pastor brings to bear the truth and grace of God. He applies the Gospel to the personal condition of the man or woman he is trying to help.

It follows that he differs from the preacher, not in authority, but in method. As with the teacher and the preacher, his authority comes from Christ and the Holy Spirit, and then from the Holy Scriptures. He represents, as they do,

those whose authority he bears, and therefore demands the attention of those to whom he ministers, that they may hear and obey the Word of God. He also is, or should be, authorized by the Church. And preacher, teacher, and pastor together continue the ministry of the Word entrusted by Christ to His Church.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

AUTHORITY IN POLITICS

'CONSTITUTIONAL change is no longer a steady march; it moves at a gallop', writes Lord Hailey (of the famous *An African Survey*) in a recent book.¹ In many territories, constitutions are adopted which, it is hoped, may last a decade, only to be cast aside after four or five years. Since the end of the war, self-government has been granted to nine-tenths of the British Commonwealth, reckoned by population—and the most difficult tenth remains, particularly the multi-racial territories. In many of these areas the Church is involved, either through its missions or through close relations with indigenous Churches. Meanwhile, political, economic and social alignments in the older countries are more fluid than they have usually been. All this means that political theory is a practical issue in these days, and one which claims Christian attention.

The political problem is to reconcile liberty and obligation, and a realistic solution must take account of the economic and social relationships of the people concerned. Whether a country has traditions or not, in our era the answer to the problem constantly requires restatement. As the political equilibrium is undermined by economic or social change, the checks and balances need adjusting and sometimes radically altering. In this country our own generation inherited universal adult suffrage, and has not, of course, tried to extend it to minors. But it has sought to make more genuine the theoretical political equality it took over, by removing extremes of economic inequality. Failure to make such political adjustments to match the realities of society can precipitate revolt.

To appreciate how much political organization changes in a relatively short time, it has to be remembered that the Nation-State as we know it, which we already talk of superseding, is a mere stripling. Not so long ago, much that is now assumed to pertain to the State pertained to the feudal lord or the Church. Only thirty-nine years ago, at the Conference of Versailles, was it decided that nationality gave a title to nationhood. Even today the specialization of function

between Church and State is quite incomplete. In Cyprus the Church is the traditional guardian of the people, and Archbishop Makarios is also designated *Ethnarch*—a political office.

Why should political obligation exist? Simply because man does not live in isolation, and society needs organizing. 'If eating and drinking be natural, herding is so too', wrote Shaftesbury. It is not only literary taste that makes us seek an alternative expression. The bovine metaphor is inapt, because man's gregariousness stems from that which is highest in him, and not from that which is lowest. Man is by nature societary.² God made him so. This is far more relevant than any theory of social contract.

The social contract theory takes various forms, but its essence lies in the hypothesis that men were once rank individualists, each living in complete economic and social self-sufficiency, until they 'decided' to live together in society. Christian doctrine knows no such prehistoric individualists. Man was not made to live unto himself. When man was created, society was created. Woman was created to fulfil man's need for a 'helper' (RSV)—not merely a mate—because 'it is not good that the man should be alone' (Gen. 2₁₈). The implication of the alternative creation story is the same. 'Male and female created he them. . . . And God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it . . ."' (Gen. 1_{27f}). God 'created man in His own image', and the mature Christian doctrine of God insists that the divine richness of being demands a trinity within a unity. So, just as God is a societary being, man is fundamentally societary. The recluse is not a human norm.

Throughout the Bible the basic unit is not the unqualified individual, but the individual-personality-in-a-group. The eighth-century prophets denounce social injustice, not only because it denies the individual status of the oppressed, but because it denies him his true status as an individual who needs an honourable place in society, and makes a mockery of society because the proper relationships between its constituents are undermined.

Our Lord was anything but self-sufficient. If His Commandments are as fundamental as He asserted and the Church has always emphasized, they express the inner law of man's being. Man is not to love his neighbour only in order to take the sting out of living in a crowd; he needs neighbours to love in order to be man.

All this demonstrates that the political problem in some form is not an unfortunate consequence of 'this age' of sin and distorted relationships. The Christian will not want here and now to be rid of these entanglements. When Paul accepted the political framework with all its limitations, prided himself on his Roman citizenship, and appealed to Caesar, he was not merely showing himself a child of his time. He was demonstrating (although perhaps uncritically) a real element in his Christian outlook. So the Christian cannot be politically an anarchist or a quietist. He has the rights and duties of a member of a society, and should have a profounder understanding than many of the cement which binds that society together. Furthermore, in the Christian view, that which binds him in a society binds him no less to a worldwide society than to that which centres in the parish pump, corporation council chamber, or national legislative assembly. When attention is concentrated on man's relationship with the existing political unit in which he finds himself, this must not be forgotten.

A Christian's local and national loyalties typify this wide solidarity, and are not exclusive of it.

It is significant that the most recent source-book of political documents includes a section devoted to Protestant political thought, which has been fostered and crystallized by the ecumenical movement.³ A rapid survey of some of its salient points puts our political thinking on a wider basis than Christian comment on our local political arrangements. Even if this body of thought has arisen largely in a democratic context, it is broadened by the outlook on democracy of North America, of some of those who have seen it from a colonial angle, and of those who come fresh to democracy, as well as by the influence of those who do not live in a Western type of democratic society.

Because society is part of the data, and government in some form is therefore inevitable, there must be a ruler—a source of sovereignty. Sidestepping the traditional question, 'Who should be the sovereign?' this body of non-Roman Christian thought asks: 'What should be the relationship of ruler and ruled?' This is the significance of the key concepts of 'the responsible society'. 'A responsible society is one where freedom is the freedom of men who acknowledge responsibility to justice and public order, and where those who hold political authority or economic power are responsible for its exercise to God and the people whose welfare is affected by it.'⁴ The individual citizen owes responsibility to the needs of his fellow-citizens in the community, and not finally to the State, or to whoever may embody the functions of sovereignty, or to a political ideal. The political head is finally responsible, not to his country with its traditions and peculiar mystique, not even only to people here and now, but to God first, and therefore to people as made in God's image, requiring status in a cohesive society. No system or policy can be absolutized—only God is absolute.

The Assembly further stated that 'for a society to be responsible under modern conditions it is required that the people have freedom to control, to criticize and to change their Government',⁵ and condemned 'any denial to man of an opportunity to participate in the shaping of society, for this is a duty implied in man's responsibility towards his neighbour'.⁶ In 1956 an ecumenical conference recognized that today only Government can provide security in a number of fields. But in order to guard against the increased possibility of totalitarianism arising from this increase of central power, it stressed again what had earlier been emphasized—the vital function of such groups as the university, the trade union, and voluntary organizations in preserving political freedom.⁷

This teaching does not lead to complacency about democracy, as the system which superficially accords with it, but to a constructive critique of it. Lest it be too readily concluded that democracy is the form of political organization which Christians will automatically prefer, it should be remembered that the immediate source of European democracy does not lie in Christian teaching, but much more in the ideas of the French rationalists of the eighteenth century. It is true that there is an honourable democratic tradition in the English Independents and Quakers, and that some indirect influences stem from the Reformation. But we should be aware that, historically, democracy has not been considered the natural political partner of Christianity. On the other hand, the secular humanist might well approve of democracy, because it gives its citizens the best oppor-

tunity of developing as individuals, with the minimum reciprocal obligation or responsibility. The Christian, believing that man is not at his highest when he lives wholly unto himself, should approve of democracy if it encourages the development of man-in-society, so that individuality is brought into a creative relationship with community. Present developments suggest that this is not automatic. The crucial point is that a responsible society cannot be created by legislation or political arrangements. Democracy needs Christianity if it is to possess vitality, and not to degenerate.⁸

Democracy can indeed embody some of the features of a tyranny (in the technical rather than emotional sense), especially if it be forgotten that, at its best, its essence is not the rule of the majority, but respect for minorities. M. Bertrand de Jouvenel, in a powerful and fascinating book, has gone so far as to write: 'Democracy, then, in the centralizing, pattern-making, absolutist shape which we have given to it is, it is clear, the time of tyranny's incubation.'⁹ Democratic governments are often returned on a minority vote—they need only 51 per cent. of the votes in 51 per cent. of the seats, or only 26 per cent. of the total votes, in order to achieve power. They may have among their supporters a large block of passive and unvigilant supporters. They may by cunning propaganda and skilful use of mass media bludgeon the public conscience (as did Senator McCarthy). When faced with the challenge of totalitarianism, they may, just because government itself cannot create the spiritual dynamic which democracy needs, be driven back on authoritarian measures—which must make far-sighted totalitarians gleeful even if they suffer in the present. And even in calmer times it may seem no one's business to restrict the growth of authoritarianism in a democracy. De Jouvenel writes: 'When everyone is potentially a minister, no one is concerned to cut down an office to which he aspires one day himself, or to put sand in a machine which he means to use himself when his turn comes.'¹⁰ This may be too pessimistic. But it is clear that democracy is not a complete safeguard against the abuse of political authority. We are therefore driven to the conclusion that the only safeguard is not political but spiritual—the Christian teaching, which is not individualistic, but which can supply the true basis of society.

The medieval Catholic Church claimed authority over the secular State. Politically the Reformation freed the State from the Church's rule.¹¹ But in England events took a peculiar course, and 'the Reformation involved the affairs of Church and State much more closely with one another'.¹² In the eighteenth century, Warburton's defence of the Establishment is, by contrast, that the State needs an alliance with the Church for its own health, and that this alliance ought to be with the largest of the religious societies.¹³

There are at least three reasons why we should question the Establishment. First, because the overt connexion of Church and State contradicts the fact that Christianity is only half this-worldly. Thus a recent Anglican work (which does not, however, deal with the modern Establishment) closes on this note: 'May it not be that the many minds which have sought in vain a tidy formula for the ideal relations of Church and State in a sinful world have failed because their task was like that of mixing oil and water.'¹⁴ Second, because the legal relationship of Church and State represents something close to a fiction, when only about 10 per cent. of the population are regular church-goers. If it was

meaningful in earlier days, it hardly is so now. Third, because the established Church includes only a minority of Christians in the country if Roman Catholics are reckoned, and comprises a much less dominant proportion of non-Roman Christians than used to be the case. This offends against the principle of religious freedom, which is of profound importance, and which was realized in spite of and not because of the establishment.

It is true that the attitude of the Free Churches has usually been a simple opposition to establishment, rather than a search for a more appropriate relationship. But if the growing tendency is developed, whereby Christians and the Church seek to become creatively involved in the affairs of our society, this should in time produce a more realistic and useful relationship between Church and State.

D. ALAN KEIGHLEY

¹ Introduction to *Africa in Transition*, ed. Prudence Smith, 1958.

² The word is, I believe, Ryder Smith's, and so may not be new to many readers of this journal.

³ *Documents of Modern Political Thought*, ed. T. E. Uttley and J. S. Maclure. See also *Ecumenical Documents on Church and Society (1925-53)* and *Statements of the World Council of Churches on Social Questions* (Second Edition, 1956)—both World Council of Churches.

⁴ *Official Report of the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches*, ed. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, p.77. ⁵ *ibid.*, p.78. ⁶ *ibid.*, p.78.

⁷ *The Responsible Society in National and International Affairs* (Report of the Arnoldshain Conference), p.21.

⁸ Cf. Jacques Maritain, the Roman Catholic: 'Mais ce qui importe à la vie politique . . . n'est nullement de prétendre que le christianisme serait lié à la démocratie . . . c'est de constater que la démocratie est liée au christianisme . . .', *Christianisme et Démocratie*, p.35.

⁹ *Power—the Natural History of its Growth*, p.23.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, p.22.

¹¹ Cf. *Evangelisches Soziallexikon*, col.998: 'Die Reformation wollte . . . den Staatsmann von der Herrschaft der Kirche befreien, um, ihn in seinem eigenen Gebiet der Herrschaft Christi zu unterstellen.'

¹² *The National Church and the Social Order* (Church Assembly) p.11.

¹³ *ibid.*, pp.66ff.

¹⁴ T. M. Parker, *Christianity and the State in the Light of History*, pp.171f.

AUTHORITY IN THE FAMILY

THE QUESTION of authority in the family may best be approached by way of considering the place and nature of discipline in the relationship between parents and children. Primarily, discipline refers to learning. It denotes not only a particular branch of study or knowledge, but also instruction therein, and specifically the method employed to that end—which may include both inducements and such means of coercion (including corporal chastisement) as will compel the scholar to apply himself diligently to his work. Generally speaking, therefore, discipline signifies the most effective means of accomplish-

ing a particular end—so before we can discuss authority and discipline in the family, we must establish the purpose of family life.

First, however, there is more to be said about discipline. Two kinds will readily be recognized: the discipline which is imposed from without, and which we may accept willingly (out of respect for authority, or recognition that the discipline is salutary) or unwillingly (because we cannot resist, or do not wish to take the consequences of defiance); and the discipline which is imposed, as it were, from within—that is, self-discipline (individual or corporate), undertaken not as a result of external compulsion, but from a sense of moral or social obligation. Discipline may also be regarded from other standpoints. There is the discipline which a group imposes upon its members, not through law and regulation, but by means of a consensus of opinion as to what is for the ultimate good of the community—often expressed in custom and convention. There is, too, the formalistic discipline which is satisfied with outward observance, and takes no account of inward assent or dissent; and the rigorist discipline which imposes, either from within or from without, a more exacting control than the end really justifies. All these aspects of discipline must be borne in mind when considering authority in the family.

What, then, is the purpose of family discipline? It will be useful first to answer this question in terms of the tradition within which our Western Christian culture stands. Hebrew, Greek, and Roman were united in their general conception of the family as a socio-religious institution for the production of legitimate children (that is, children of pure blood or citizen stock) and the education of such children for the service of religion and the State in adult life. The dominant authority in the family was that of the father, whose powers were exemplified pre-eminently in the Roman legal doctrine of *patria potestas*, which conferred upon him a rule which, within its limits, was virtually absolute. He was responsible to the community for the training of the next generation in the minute and exact performance of those social and cultic duties and observances upon which, so it was thought, the well-being of the community depended; and it was also his task to see that certain ideals and standards were inculcated. In short, the purpose of the family was to ensure, by every possible means, the continued existence and health of society by so subjecting the young to discipline that they would not fail in the necessary discharge of their duty to the community when they attained adult status.

Despite changes in law and custom, and in social ideals, this idea of the family and its purpose has persisted almost down to our own time, and its vestiges still survive. Discipline in the family still tends to aim at securing conformity to the standards and expectations of the group—though the rising generation is now regimented less for the future well-being of the community than for the present convenience, reputation, and social acceptability of its parents, who feel that any evident departure from the norm of behaviour reflects adversely upon them. Thus the dominant pattern of discipline is that of one imposed from without and above—a discipline which is for the most part formalistic in that the principal requirement is outward observance, and which tends to produce a self-perpetuating pattern. Is discipline of this sort good and useful? To answer this question, we must reconsider the purpose of the family and its life.

The end of discipline in the family may be defined as the attainment of a

harmonious and creative communal life in which all its members, through their relationships, may advance towards greater maturity. Discipline, therefore, is not something imposed by parents upon their children, but something to which they and their children alike submit—for the parents are also in the process of growth towards personal maturity, which is never attained at the same time as biological, legal, or political adulthood. This demands a revision of popular notions of the roles appropriate to parents and children in the family.

The family is not an adult community in which the children have no share until they attain adult status. Rather, it is a community of human beings in varying stages of growth towards maturity—a community in which, paradoxically, all have equal rights, but some have greater responsibilities which carry corresponding privileges. On one level are the parents, already mature in body, and conditioned by education and experience of life to at least a certain maturity of mind and spirit—yet already to some extent closed in outlook, unconsciously conforming more and more to traditional stereotypes of parenthood and adulthood, and anxious to avoid any appearance of nonconformity to the expectations of their group. On another level are the children, relatively unconditioned, inexperienced, open-minded and adventurous, and scarcely aware of adult pressures towards conformity with group patterns. Both parents and children are *persons* whose integrity must be respected, and the object of discipline and authority in the family must be to secure for both the conditions necessary for growth.

The most common fault in parents is that of expecting children to think and behave as adults, and to order their lives according to accepted adult standards—hence the ‘good’ child is the outward conformist, and the ‘naughty’ child the determined individualist who insists upon being a child and not an imitation grown-up. The disciplines which are based upon this view of the child often give the impression of being devised unconsciously to ensure that the even course of adult life is disturbed as little as possible—to which end unlimited disturbance of the child’s life is permissible. This might be defended on the ancient assumption that the child had no right to its own life but was simply in training for adulthood—but not otherwise.

It is essential to understand that, in the family, life is lived simultaneously upon two or more levels between which movement and communication are necessarily limited—though by the exercise of a sympathetic imagination the adult can perhaps understand a little of the child’s world. But it is useless to expect the child to know instinctively anything of the adult world, or even to learn to understand the grown-up attitudes. It is one thing to admonish and coerce, and another to win comprehension (in so far as that is possible) and assent. The child will learn better by experience than by precept; but this is a long process, which the adult must accept patiently, recognizing the child’s limited capacities, and the enormous tasks of adjustment which face it in the process of growth.

Family discipline needs to be reformulated with reference to the real facts of family life. It will, first, be a corporate discipline—one to which all (and not the children only) submit, as the necessary condition of attaining the true end of family life. For the adult members, this discipline will be one imposed from within, and will be one primarily of understanding and patience. It will demand

the effort of trying to live sincerely and with realism in two different dimensions at once—in the adult world and the child world—and this will prove the easier if, with the passage of years, the adult tries to retain something of a link with childhood. We are often too anxious to grow up quickly as adolescents, and as adults to put away childish things. There is certainly a right and necessary growing up, and there are childish things which ought to be abandoned; but there is also a true childlikeness, a sympathy with the child, which we ought never to lose.

The task of framing a family discipline, then, will be largely that of translating into ideas which the child can assimilate—and, even more, into *experiences* of vivid meaning—those conditions which the adult sees to be necessary for the attainment of good community life as a family. This cannot be done by affecting the aloof, olympian majesty of the Victorian paterfamilias, nor by applying the cane or the slipper. It is possible only when the parent descends (or better, moves across) to the child's level, and sets himself in humility and understanding at the side of the child. Above all, a true family discipline will emanate from love—from the relationship of warm affection and full identification which should subsist between parents and children. The 'naughty' child may be a child whose security has been undermined by faulty relationship, and the 'good' (not the 'goody-goody') child one whose life is stable because it is rooted in affection. Ultimately, family discipline becomes a matter, not of rules and regulations, but of the fruits of creative relationship; and this means that Christians, who stand for the integrity of the family, must give more thought to the psychological factors which determine that integrity.

One very important factor in the establishment of discipline is the set of values which is established and observed in the family. Not only should these values be clear and be treated as determinative, but they should be values to which all conform; it is of no use whatever for parents to inculcate values for their children which they deny themselves. This question of values applies particularly to the problems which come with adolescence, when the youth is attempting to establish himself in the alien adult world. There will inevitably be blunders as he tries to adopt the attitudes and patterns of behaviour of the grown-up, and it is important that he should be welcomed by his parents, and not resented as an intruder into their preserve who must be kept at bay by repressive disciplines. In all that is essential, the adolescent should be treated as what he wishes to be; and the inculcation of a single set of sound values will ensure that there is moral continuity between the child world which is being left behind, and the adult world into which he is moving.

Inevitably, the child's discipline will be one imposed from without, yet in such a manner as to win assent and co-operation through love, and to lead gradually to the replacement of external by internal discipline. For the due ordering of family life there must, of course, be rules; but it is most important to avoid both formalism and rigorism, and salutary for parents to scrutinize with honesty the reasons which lead them to lay down regulations. Where rules are reasonable and are framed for the good of all, exceptions should not be made arbitrarily or for the benefit of adults alone, and infringement will naturally demand sanctions and punitive discipline. The latter, however, should not appear as a form of adult coercion; it should be inflicted justly and without emotional involvement,

and in every case the question should be: Is corporal or another form of punishment the best retribution and correction? The degree of punishment meted out should be relative to the degree of moral wrongdoing, and should not be determined simply by the measure of inconvenience occasioned by the fault; and nowhere more than in the case of the child does the principle apply that justice should not only be done, but should be seen to be done.

The nature of authority in the family is clearly disclosed by this discussion of the discipline by which family life ought to be governed. Before all else, it is an authority which rests upon love and is exercised in love; it does not reside, as ancient theory declared, in the autocratic will of the father, nor in that of the parents jointly. In practice, it is true, they are in a position of authority and are responsible for the discipline by means of which the members of the family are enabled to grow towards maturity, but the authority which they wield is, paradoxically, an authority under which they themselves stand. The ultimate source of authority in the family is the will of God, by whose appointment the community of parents and children affords a unique and indispensable sphere for the development of character through personal relationship; and parents express their obedience, not in assuming an authoritarian role, but in allowing themselves to be used as God's instruments. Their pattern is He who, though Lord, was in the midst of men as One who served, and who emptied Himself in order to assume the likeness of men, yet displayed His authority in humility. They, too, most effectively demonstrate their parental authority in the disciplined service of their children, and in the patience, sympathy, and imaginative effort demanded of them as they try to set themselves alongside the little ones in order to understand and to communicate, and so to lead them towards maturity.

SHERWIN BAILEY

The Editor is always pleased to consider articles, or suggestions for articles, for the LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW. Typescripts should not normally exceed 2,500 words in length, and a stamped addressed envelope should also be enclosed.

'MAD GRIMSHAW' AND HIS COVENANTS WITH GOD

A Study in Eighteenth-century Psychology

PART II

STILL another year passed on, with its trials and its triumphs, and also with its bitter failures. Grimshaw decided to try another weapon in his perpetual fight with temptation. He began to keep a diary, solemnizing the event by another renewal of his Covenant.¹

The diary begins thus:

A.D. 1755. A Diary of my Life begun Sepr: 14th: 1755: on which Day I enter'd into ye 48th Year of my Age.

Sepr. 14th.—It is now full twenty Years, since I was first affected with Desires & Purposes after a Divine & Religious Life, and above sixteen Years, since I began to fall under more deep Concern, and about twelve Years, since I have Reason to believe I receivd the Peace of GOD thro Faith in the Blood and Righteousness of my Dear SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.—In all these Periods of Life, I have gone thro' manifold Trials & Tribulations, which wou'd make many large Volumes—Notwithstanding which, I have been, Glory be to God, wonderfully preserved, even unto this Day. It wou'd probably have been very useful & profitable for my Soul had I carefully, as many of GOD'S Servants formerly, and at this Day many of them still do, keep a Diary of the most material Things that I have either done, or which have occur'd to me thro that Tract of Time.—I have sometimes thought to do so but hitherto never did. Of late I've sometimes thought it was too late, as my Days seem to be far spent, to begin such a Diary. But promising myself that Benefit thereby in some Degree still, which I now may apprehend, I for want thereof have so long Time depriv'd myself of, I begin now.—THIS DAY, being my BIRTH-DAY—I renewd my Resolutions . . . as also my Vow & Covenant in the most solemn Manner to be in all possible Respects thro HIS Grace to be the LORD'S for Ever. . . .

After this introduction, he proceeds to give short summaries of the incidents and spiritual experience of each day. Sometimes he can say:

This Day my watch over my Heart & Ways has been good—and GOD has been with me all Day.

Quite often, however, there is a mixture of happiness and shame, as on Sunday, 21st September 1755:

Glory be to GOD this has been a sweet Sabaoth to my Soul—I had Considerable Liberty while preaching both Morning & Evening in the Church—In the Way to Bradford to meet Mr Whitefield I was very happy—Liked well my Conversation with him, particularly while he baptizd 4 Children—I came home with the Clerk late, trifled in my Conversation with Him, gave way to a great temptation after I got Home—O what need have I to watch and pray?

This led to a further renewal of his covenant the next day:

This Day I wrestled with my LORD for Pardon. I hope, found it & renewd my Vow most religiously & solemnly.

And so it continues, joy and despair following swiftly on each other's heels, occasionally a long period of peace being followed by a week of spiritual misery. In 1756 the adjective 'usual' is frequently added to the word 'temptation'. On 24th June that year things seemed to come to a head—although it will be noticed that his inner turmoil did not prevent Grimshaw from carrying out a very hard day's work:

A dreadful Day!—Sorely tempted, and sorely gave Way. In a most solemn Manner renewd my Vow—so often renewd before and violated. Preachd at Lingbob & Manningham—In terrible Thunder & Lightning! Wh. greatly frighted & awed ye Congregation, I hope, to hear & receive ye Word. LORD grant, I may never forget this Day on divers Accounts!

What were the 'usual temptations' which led to this day? Possibly, as James Everett in an unpublished biography of Grimshaw suggests, they may have been fits of temper at the waywardness of his son John, who was revealing in his own behaviour what his father might so easily have become. Certainly Grimshaw was prone to anger, and had many provocations thereto. 'Trifling' was another oft-recurring temptation. He made it a rule never to talk in a light-hearted way, or about nothing in particular, his maxim being 'Few Words make a peaceful Conscience'. His diary shows, however, that he frequently fell from his high standards in this matter.

There is what almost amounts to proof, however, that Grimshaw's 'usual temptation' was neither anger nor levity, but what he calls 'lust'. It has been pointed out that his was a virile, full-blooded nature. He did not wait for long after his first wife died before he married again, even though it was completely against his own ascetic promptings, and even though once more his partner was unconverted. It seems likely that, after her death, perhaps somewhere around 1750, his bodily appetites again grew too strong for him, and he had recourse to frequent covenants to aid him in his battle with temptation, after a long period of comparative calm. He found himself constantly breaking his vow to think of women only as souls to be saved. The sight of one of his women parishioners in bed through illness, the touch of a woman's hand, even the brush of her dress, was liable to arouse in him the smouldering fires of passion. So much was this so that in 1758 he almost married yet again. We do not suggest that he hugged to himself these manifestations of 'lust'. The very fact that they arose in his mind, however, and that sometimes he found it impossible to banish them immediately, caused him great distress. The words of our Lord were impressed forcibly on him, 'Whoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart'—and his interpretation of the phrase 'lust after her' was very wide indeed.

'Lust'—that is, natural sexual desire—was in Grimshaw's belief and experience the main source of sin, the more so because its temptations were not like others, easily recognized as such, but were 'sweet and delightful', and therefore more insidious:

I feel there is a great Deal of Difference between the Impressions that temptations to lust & other temptations have, for whereas other temptations the more Hold I feel they get of my Heart the more are they detested by Me; but this the more I suffer it to creep upon me, the more unwilling I am to part with it. . . . O that we may take special Heed of this Snare, & stifle it at the first Appearance.

This attempt to 'stifle it at its first appearance' was Grimshaw's reaction to the outward manifestations of his thwarted instincts. He believed that by throwing himself upon God's power, by means of his covenants, his natural appetites might be completely subdued, although actual experience taught him that there was something wrong, either with his reasoning, or with his faith in God. He was not content merely to resist temptation, however. He wished to conquer it completely, by the method which we today might call sublimation:

In temptation, I find it too little to resist the tempter: Resistance is good; but Resistance is no Victory. I find I must overcome. How is this? I find I must not rest, and think myself safe: Til I've wrested the tempter's sword out of his hand & plung'd it into his own breast.—When do I find I this? When I by the kind of temptation am driven to the Opposite virtue, as when by temptation to lust I betake myself to means & Exercises of Chastity.—by pride to humility: &c. Thus the devil is beat with his own weapons.

In spite of both repression and sublimation, his passionate nature continually made itself felt in outbursts of his 'usual temptation'. Many people would agree that it also came to the surface indirectly in the rigorous asceticism which he inflicted upon himself—allied to the monachistic flagellations of the medieval mystic—and in his firm determination that others should similarly deny themselves—there are several stories about Grimshaw which suggest a streak of sadism. There is not sufficient space, however, to develop this aspect of the problem here.

That Grimshaw's repressed sexual desires were the chief source of his battlings with temptation is confirmed and illustrated by the last entries in his manuscript note-book entitled 'Experiences'. These relate to that very day, 24th June 1756, referred to in his diary as 'A dreadful Day', which led to a fresh renewal of his covenant. The introductory remarks are sufficiently important to be quoted in their entirety:

I have often found by simply touching a Woman's Hand, talking in a trifling Way with Women; or but touching their Garment, in a modest Manner, lust arise, which, by looking at too long, has brought guilt, darkness, Loss of GOD'S presence, Condemnation and Grief upon my Soul—By all of which I have been brought to walk heavily many a Day; to vow and protest in the most solemn Manner to ALMIGHTY GOD thro' HIS Divine Assistance to do so no more, but wholly to be given up in Chastity, Purity & Holiness to HIM: & have as constantly broke that solemn Engagement hitherto, which Violations have likewise added no little to that Grief and Heaviness. Insomuch that I have often thought I either shortly shou'd, or really already had so grieved the HOLY SPIRIT in Me, that HE wou'd utterly and everlastingly forsake Me—Nay I've sometimes felt something somewhat resembling it as I thought, in my Heart.

After this confession of his prevailing temptation for 'many a Day', he comes to the events of 24th June, in which we note the phrase '*usual guilt*':

This Day I've felt such a temptation assaulting me by talking with and touching a Woman's Hand, which has brought me under my usual Guilt, Heaviness, & Grief, and into the like Fear of having griev'd the HOLY GHOST in Me & provoked HIM to leave me to myself for Ever; which I am greatly troubled for. I wou'd not offend GOD, my Dear, my Gracious, my long-suffering & patient GOD again in this, or in any other Offence, for the Value of this & ten thousand World's more. . . . And therefore feeling that still GOD's HOLY SPIRIT is with Me, that I am not (O wonderful Mercy!) forsaken by HIM; but that He doth & will still abide in Me & with me, if I be faithful & provoke HIM in this Manner no more; I say therefore feeling HIS presence now, I am determin'd for Ever, as being HIS OWN Son Servant by Regeneration, Adoption & Grace & by the Blood & Righteousness of JESUS my Dear SAVIOUR to desist all I conveniently can, from the aforesaid, & every other, Occasion of such temptations & from all such temptations themselves also utterly. I will not, GOD enabling, any more grieve or offend the HOLY GHOST, my known Dear Life and COMFORTER any more by these Things. I will not do it by touching talking with, or looking at any Woman. No: I detest it utterly, and solemnly will decline it in such a Manner, or to such an End or Danger of lustful temptation for the future.

The snatches of legal phraseology here will have been noticed. The closing declaration, with its awesome list of witnesses, smacks even more of the lawyer's office:

And conformable with my many former Vows & Dedications of myself to GOD, particularly that solemn One wrote at large on Parchment bearing Date Decemr. 4th, 1752 I do most solemnly & eternally give up, devote & dedicate myself Spirit Soul & Body to my Dear and for Ever Blessed TRIUNE GOD. And to this my solemn Dedication & Vow, I do hereby solemnly invoke as Witnesses thereto All the Powers of Heaven—GOD the FATHER SON and HOLY GHOST; All the Holy Angels and all the Souls & Spirits of Just Men made perfect;—All the powers & solemn Things on Earth: The Church, the Word of GOD, the LORD'S Supper, Men, Earth, Living Creatures, Sun Moon & Starrs; And, if it matter any Thing, all that is in Hell too, devils & all damn'd souls, to bear Witness to this Renewal of this my solemn Dedication & Vow to GOD. Bear Witness all ye that I am devoted to GOD in the aforesd. Manner. Yea, I am solemnly HIS henceforth for Ever and Ever according to the full Tenour & purport of my Aforesd. Dedication on Parchment.—Let this present paper Dedication also, bearing Date this 24th. day of June 1756 bear Witness too—Yea, let it bear Witness against me at the awful Bar of the last Judgment, if I am not my GOD's & serve HIM not circumspectly all the Residue of my Time until my Change come. . . .

This document is almost terrible in its intensity. So fortified, the hosts of heaven, earth, and even hell, being his witnesses, surely there could be no more yielding to temptation for William Grimshaw! The desires of the flesh still remained stubborn, however, so that only five weeks later he added the following note:

N.B.—Having had again been thrice tempted in the Like Manner, that gave Occasion

to this Paper-Dedication, I now renew it in the same Solemn Manner and Words, as above, resolv'd thro' the Divine Assistance, craved as above, to violate and renew it no more, so long as I live:—Witness my Hand, GOD being my Help, this twenty ninth Day of July, 1756. Amen, Amen, Amen. Wm. Grimshaw.

In another three weeks he was renewing it yet again!

N.B.—Having been again twice tempted in ye same manner I once more & for ever (not intending to renew again, or give Occasion for it) solemnly devote Body Soul & Spirit to GOD, considering HIS Graces, Mercies, & numberless Blessings, Spiritual & temporal bestow'd on & promis'd to Me. THINE, O TRIUNE GOD, thro' THY Grace & Love will I solely, solemnly and eternally be. Witness for ye last Time & for ever my Hand ye 18th of August 1756. Wm. Grimshaw.

He was mistaken, however. It was not 'the last Time and for ever.' The slight scraps of his Diary which remain for the Spring of 1757 show him only just managing to hold his own. For instance on March 22nd he writes 'Visited 2 sick Women—tempted to lust, but (delivered) from giving Way actually—Glory be to GOD for it! Amen.' In August, 1758, he is still tormented by his temptations, and wonders whether marrying yet another wife will serve to quench the fires, or will only arouse fiercer ones. He cannot make up his mind. To decide the matter he resorts to a method of chance, letting his marriage depend on the spin of a gold coin. It comes down 'Tails' (or was it 'Heads?'). It is settled. He must not marry again. This decided, he feels he must send overboard yet another Covenant anchor:

Yesterday morning, being Saturday, Augt. 5th. 1758, I had it, as I think, manifested to me, by a certain sort of Indication (by a Trial of tossing up of a Joa)—[i.e. A 'Joannese' or 'Joe', a Portuguese coin] that it is not expedient that I may denuo Uxorem ducere—[i.e. marry again]. . . . And therefore this Day, being LORD'S Day and Sacrament Day, I renew solemnly, devoutly and fully the aforesd. Solemn Dedication, made or renew'd on Midsummer Day in the Year 1756—I renew it solemnly, and conscientiously from the very Ground of my Heart, I say, this 6th Day of August 1758, upon this Paper; and purpose thro' Grace to ratify and confirm the same this Day at ye Holy Table. And I do earnestly implore, and entirely rest upon, the Assistance of the HOLY GHOST to perform the same to the Sole Glory of my All-Glorious and All-Gracious GOD and my temporal, Spiritual and Eternal Comfort and Happiness thro' JESUS CHRIST Our Lord—So help me GOD. William Grimshaw.

For a time things went very well with him, and on 2nd November 1758 he wrote to Mrs Gallatin, apparently almost forgetful of his past troubles:

[God] has been amazingly gracious to me now near thrice seven years; but never more so than of late, and even at present. Praise the Lord, O my soul! Tho' I've borne many heavy crosses and gone through many grievous trials and troubles since I saw you, yet the Lord was with me in them all, and has sanctified them all unto me. . . . I can truly say I never, that I remember, lost His presence for a moment this twelve years or upwards.

His trials were not over, however. Nor were his renewals of his covenant.

In 1760 he turned again to that 1752 covenant—the one so carefully written on parchment, which he endorsed:

I renewed this solemn Dedication in a most awful manner, 5th of June, 1760. O that day! I carefully remember and keep it.

He adds, apparently having forgotten or completely renounced his intention not 'to renew again, or to give Occasion for it':

I propose to renew this Dedication, with a quarterly fast, the first Friday in January, April, July, and October, during life.

This sounds almost as if he were lapsing into formalism, as if the fires of temptation were dying down, but that nevertheless he thought it well to keep on with a familiar practice. Certainly his physical powers were on the wane, for he confesses to Mrs Gallatin in 1759:

You will please to excuse bad writing. My eyes are of late grown so dim, that I can scarcely see to write or read, and the other day I broke my spectacles.

But he had not yet reached that hypothetical state when he would be free from temptation, or at least free from any yielding to it. In fact he was doubtful if that were really possible, disagreeing heartily with John Wesley on the question of Christian Perfection, and writing to him in 1760:

My perfection is to see my own imperfection; my comfort, to feel that I have the world, flesh, and devil to overthrow through the Spirit and merits of my dear Saviour; and my desire and hope is, to love God with all my heart, mind, soul, and strength, to the last gasp of life. This is my perfection. I know no other, expecting to lay down my life and my sword together.

Only four months before this last challenging sentence was to become true he gave his considered views on sin and temptation in the twenty-six articles of his 'Creed'. These reaffirm in detail his conviction that temptation to sin was an inevitable and valuable part of the life of every man, no matter how good, though he must strive against it:

I believe, it is by the Spirit we are enabled, not to *eradicate*, as some affirm (for that is absurd) but to *subjugate*, the old man: To *suppress*, not *extirpate*, the exorbitancies of our fleshly appetites . . . and to grow in grace, *gradually*, not *repentively* (i.e. *suddenly*, or *all at once*) unto the perfect and eternal day. This is all I know, or acknowledge, to be Christian Perfection, or Sanctification.

In his 'Experiences' he had said:

The older we grow in CHRIST, the seldomer, but the stronglier are we tempted. And the dangerousest temptation is to be seldom tempted. For then we are apter to be off our Guard, and then if the devil surprises us with a temptation, we are betray'd into a Compliance with it unawares—This plainly shews, that a Christian should be always under Arms, and never off His Watch.

Grimshaw was always 'under Arms', and in his 'Creed' expects to be so to his dying day:

I believe, that all true believers, will be daily tempted by the flesh, as well as the world and the devil, even to their lives end; and that they shall feel an inclination, more or less, to comply, yea, and do comply therewith.

That dying day for him was not far distant. On 7th April 1763 his lifelong struggle came to an end. According to his early wish, he was buried by the side of his first wife in Luddenden Church, the stone reading:

Sarah daughter of John Lockwood of Ewood, Gent, the Wife of the Revd. Wm. Grimshaw, Minister of Todmorden, who died Nov. 1, 1739.

Also the Revd. Wm. Grimshaw, Minister of Haworth, who died April 7, 1763, aged 55.

A careful and honest survey of the materials available convinces us that William Grimshaw was very far from being 'mad', although he undoubtedly passed through several severe spiritual crises, with accompanying mental and physical distress. These crises were made more severe by the tense atmosphere of a religious revival, stirring up deep and often uncontrollable emotions and physical phenomena. They were also intensified by the emotional tension within his own life, as he endeavoured to subjugate strong bodily appetites and passions, maintaining at the same time an exaggerated idea of their sinfulness. Grimshaw lived in an age of exaggeration, and of some of its extremer aspects he is typical. He saw himself as a pigmy, battling with giant emotions—continually being struck to the ground, but just as continually struggling to his feet, vowing, 'By the grace of God, never again!' We today might be inclined to compare him to a threadbare knight tilting at windmills, and toy windmills at that. Yet such a hasty judgement would be greatly mistaken, in ignoring the high, almost inevitably unattainable standards, which Grimshaw set himself. The amazing thing is that in spite of his many failures he resolutely kept on, with a solemn covenanting of himself to God, believing that the scars would heal into firmer flesh. So to the end he found, and fought, temptation, and finish only came to the titanic struggle when he 'lay down his life and his sword together'. FRANK BAKER

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arminian and Methodist Magazines, 1778 onwards.

Dickons, J. N., *Kirkgate Chapel*, Bradford, 1903.

Hardy, R. S., *William Grimshaw, Incumbent of Haworth*, 2nd ed., 1861.

Harrison, Mrs E., *Methodist Good Companions*.

— *Haworth Parsonage*, 1937.

Jackson, T. (ed.), *Journal of the Rev. Charles Wesley*.

Laycock, J. W., *Methodist Heroes in the Great Haworth Round*, 1909.

Middleton, E., *Biographica Evangelica*. Vol. IV, 1786.

Myles, W., *Life and Writings of the late Rev. William Grimshaw*, 1806.

Newton, J., *Memoirs of the Life of the late Rev. William Grimshaw*, 1799.

Ryle, J. C., *Christian Leaders of the Last Century*, 1873.

(Seymour, A. C. H.), *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon*, 1840.

Southey, R., *Life of Wesley* (many editions).

Stamp, W. W., *Methodism in Bradford*, 1841.

Telford, J. (ed.), *Wesley's Veterans*, n.d.

Venn, H., *Christ the Joy of the Christian's Life . . . a Sermon preached on the Death of the Reverend Mr. Wm. Grimshaw . . .* 1763.

Wesley, J., *Journals* (Standard Edition, especially IV.493-8).

— *Letters* (Standard Edition).

Wesley Historical Society, *Proceedings*, especially Volumes X and XXIV.

MANUSCRIPT MATERIAL

Everett, James, 'The Curate of Haworth', together with notes collected for its preparation from various people.

Grimshaw, William, *Diary*, 1755-7.

— 'Experiences gather'd by Conversations with my own & the Souls of others'.

— 'The Believer's Golden Chain'.

— 'The Admonition of a Sinner'.

— 'The Nature, State and Conduct of a Christian'.

¹ This diary has been published in the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, Vol. XXIV.

ST ALBAN

WHO was St Alban? Haddon's article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* begins: 'Albanus, the protomartyr of Britain—if he ever existed.' Hardly encouraging! I propose to begin with the first hazy reference to Christians in Britain about the year AD 200, then go on to the first well-defined personality about AD 400, and so work back towards Albanus standing midway between.

It is Tertullian of Carthage, about AD 200, who first writes of Christians in Britain. Harnack dismisses this brusquely: 'Tertullian's notice is of no consequence.'¹ I do not see why. Look at the context.² Tertullian is trying to persuade Jews that the foretold Messiah has come. He quotes Psalm 19⁴: 'Their line is gone out through all the earth and their words to the end of the world.' He asks, 'Who is it in whom all nations have begun to believe?' and lists the peoples among whom Christians are to be found. He begins, 'Parthians and Medes and Elamites and the dwellers in Mesopotamia'. What is he doing?

Tertullian is a Latin, belonging to Carthage. The strength of the second-century Church is Greek and stands to the east. Still farther into Asia there are Christians whose language is Syriac. This eastern fringe is not personally known to Tertullian, so it is convenient for him to quote Acts 2, the list of places from which came some of the converts on the Day of Pentecost. Then from the east he switches to the western fringe, where he himself belongs. He starts near home: there are Christians, he knows, in Libya and Morocco. Next comes 'all the boundaries of Spain'. That is known too. Spain was on the list from St Paul's own day (Rom 15^{24, 28}). And he goes on, 'the different peoples of Gaul'. He must have had personal knowledge here. The forty-eight martyrs of Lyons had been famous for twenty years, and the equally famous Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, was living and writing still. And next, he mentions 'places of the Britons'. Why assume that suddenly he is entering the unknown, leaving fact for fiction? As if to reassure us, Tertullian gives more than the geographic reference: 'Places of the Britons', he writes, 'unreached by the Romans, but subject to Christ.' Such a man as Tertullian would know of Hadrian's Wall, built in AD 128; know too of the attempt that the later Antonine Wall represents, to hold the Forth and the Clyde as civilization's frontier.³ A few years before Tertullian wrote, the Antonine Wall had been overrun. Soon the reigning Emperor, Septimius Severus, was to go out with his two sons. By hard fighting they would push back the barbarians, and though they would not re-establish the northern line, they would restore that of Hadrian before the death of Severus at York in the year 211. In the midst of all these current events, Tertullian is claiming that the Church reaches farther than the might of Rome. His enthusiasm may have carried him away. He often does exaggerate. But you cannot easily say that he had no facts to go on. So much for the year 200: Christians already in Britain, but nothing definite—no names given.

Now on to AD 400. It is a blow to our insular pride that the first Christian from Britain who is not only a name, but a vital figure in Church history, should be the heretic Pelagius. Where did he come from? *Pelagios* is Greek, 'man of the sea'. In English we Latinize it, 'mariner'. The Welsh for it might be 'Morgan', and, with insufficient evidence, he has sometimes been assigned to North Wales.⁴ The contemporary Jerome makes him more barbarous still: 'He has his lineage', he writes, 'of Scottish race from the neighbourhood of Britain.'⁵ In controversy Jerome always tried to make his opponent look ridiculous, and he goes on to describe Pelagius as '*pultibus Scottorum praegravatus*'—'weighed down with the porridge of the Scots'—surely the earliest reference to that national dish! Pelagius's heresy was to treat too lightly the problem of human sin. What man needed, he said, was not radical transformation by the grace of God, but to be taught better, and himself to make the effort to be better. Native to Britain, this heresy seems to have got a great hold here. A synod of the Church in Britain invited two bishops of Gaul to come over as a mission of help, Germanus of Auxerre and Lupus of Troyes, and in the year 429 they came.

The biographer of Germanus⁶ wrote some fifty years after the events, and gives us a glimpse of the country in that brief interval between the departure of the Romans and the settlement of the English. With the Roman legions had gone the Roman peace. The Picts were ravaging from the north, and, already,

Saxons from over the North Sea. The two bishops went preaching and baptizing among the soldiers. Just after Easter in the year 430, they were with a British army awaiting the enemy in a narrow valley near Mold. The visiting bishops gave the troops the Easter greeting, 'Christ is risen!' and the army's threefold response, 'Alleluiah!' so resounded through the glen that it struck terror to the hearts of the heathen and they fled—the Alleluiah Victory. Already before this the bishops had triumphed in the cause that had brought them over. They had preached everywhere they went, in little churches and to greater numbers in the fields. Finally, they had met the Pelagian leaders in full-scale debate at a vast open-air meeting, and the crowd had acclaimed the bishops with shouts of victory. The biographer continues: 'When the damnable heresy of Pelagius had been put down, its agents silenced, and the souls of all settled in purity of faith, the bishops made their way to the blessed Albanus the martyr, to give thanks to God through him.' And then he adds: 'The special merits and mediation of Albanus the martyr afforded them a calm crossing [of the Channel], and in quietness the happy vessel brought back the great men to their waiting people.'

This is the first mention of St Alban. No place is named and no date for the martyrdom, but it is certain that in the year 430 there was a shrine, and the martyr was deemed by bishops from Gaul to be their advocate with God.

For the place, an estimate of the time, and a story of the martyrdom we have to go to Gildas, the monk who about the year 560 writes the history of his country's ruin by the heathen English. Before getting to that sad story of his own times, he reviews the heroic period of persecution under the Emperor Diocletian, in the years following 303:

God who willeth that all men should be saved did not leave Britain full-shrouded in the thick darkness of black night. In the above-mentioned persecution, as we infer, He lit for us the brightest of lights. And the graves of their bones and the places of their martyrdom might now in the minds of beholders excite no small fervour of love to God, had they not, in return for our exceeding wickedness, been lost to our people by the lamentable disruption of the barbarians. I mean Albanus of Verulam, Aaron and Julius, citizens of the City of the Legions, and others of both sexes and in different places who stood fast with the highest courage in the contest for Christ. The first of these . . . for the sake of love, saved another confessor when he was about to be taken, by hiding him in his house, and then changing clothes with him. In this he followed the example of Christ who laid down His life for His sheep.⁷

'City of the Legions'—that is, garrison town—might be used of Chester, York, or Carlisle, but probably '*urbs legionum*' means Caerleon in Monmouthshire. The very name Caerleon is a telescoping of '*castra legionum*'. More decisive, the charter of a church dedicated to 'the holy martyrs Julius and Aaron' can be traced in Caerleon back to about the year 870.⁸ One hears of none other such, and probably this dedication goes back to the time of Gildas, three centuries before. Gildas speaks of Albanus 'of Verulam'; again, no other town claims him.

Just one thing might make us doubt the geography. Among the marvels which Gildas records as the saint went to his death is this: 'He opened a path across the noble River Thames, whose waters stood abrupt like cliffs on either hand.' Verulam is on a small tributary of the Thames, but hardly a noble river.

Still, we need not doubt. Gildas depends on an earlier martyr-story. His knowledge of the place is hearsay. But surely it was this shrine at Verulam at which the bishops Germanus and Lupus had given thanks in the year 430, and this was the scene of Saint Alban's martyrdom.

When? Did you notice Gildas's qualifying clause? 'In Diocletian's persecution, *as we infer*.' He did not know, so how can we? Some indeed have challenged his inference, and on this ground: Eusebius emphatically states that Constantius Chlorus, the Western Caesar, and later Augustus, under whose rule Britain lay, was 'favourable and kind. He took not the smallest part in persecution of the Christians'.⁹ Must we say that Alban and Aaron and Julius, and the others of both sexes, must go back beyond Diocletian's persecution in 303, to Valerian in 260, or Decius in 250?¹⁰ Three considerations make me say, 'No': first, Eusebius is writing in the pro-Christian reign of Constantius's son, Constantine. What more natural than to exaggerate the peace of the Church under Constantine's father? Second, apart from such exaggeration, Eusebius's words need not mean that there were no local incidents, no underlings who persecuted, when persecution was the declared imperial policy. And, third, I cannot recall ever having had to rescue a personage of the Early Church from too *late* a date; a historian's work moves in the opposite direction!

Here then we have found a real saint, a fixed place, a probable date—Albanus, Verulam, soon after 303. Now, what of the story of the martyrdom? Gildas gives some of it, but the fullest account is from Bede, in his *Ecclesiastical History*¹¹ finished in the year 731. We may seem to be turning to a record which, compared with Gildas's 560, is very late. However, Bede's chapter on St Alban has long been recognized as of different style, a unit complete in itself. Gildas depended on an earlier martyr-story, but Bede seems to have lifted the story as it stood, and incorporated it into his text. This was suspected before; in the year 1904 it was proved by Professor Wilhelm Meyer of Göttingen in one of the finest examples of modern historical and literary criticism.¹² Meyer discovered manuscripts of this *Passio Albani*; it survives in three recensions: first the martyr-story, second an epitome of it, and third a re-expansion of the epitome. It was this third, and latest, recension which Bede, and to a less extent Gildas, used. So the first recension cannot be much later than five hundred. There are signs that it was composed in Auxerre. *The Life of Germanus*, written about 480, had mentioned the shrine of St Alban, and no one knew him. Who was this martyr of Britain, so revered by their own great bishop?

But if no one at Auxerre knew about St Alban, how could anyone there write about his martyrdom? Meyer's detailed work on this *Passio Albani* shows that they borrowed extracts from a number of Roman and Gallic martyrologies—a happening belonging to this saint, a conversation attributed to that, a miracle after the manner of still another. Sometimes the very phrasing is retained, and all are transferred to St Alban. Let me outline the story that results:

Alban, a heathen, gives shelter to a Christian priest. His example, and then his instruction, win Alban to the Faith. Soldiers come to arrest the priest, but Alban wears his cloak and gets himself taken. The judge demands his name, but Alban is more concerned to confess his faith. The judge commands him to sacrifice to the gods. Alban answers they are not gods, but devils. He is condemned. Crowds coming to watch the execution fill the river bridge; so Alban,

Saxons from over the North Sea. The two bishops went preaching and baptizing among the soldiers. Just after Easter in the year 430, they were with a British army awaiting the enemy in a narrow valley near Mold. The visiting bishops gave the troops the Easter greeting, 'Christ is risen!' and the army's threefold response, 'Alleluiah!' so resounded through the glen that it struck terror to the hearts of the heathen and they fled—the Alleluiah Victory. Already before this the bishops had triumphed in the cause that had brought them over. They had preached everywhere they went, in little churches and to greater numbers in the fields. Finally, they had met the Pelagian leaders in full-scale debate at a vast open-air meeting, and the crowd had acclaimed the bishops with shouts of victory. The biographer continues: 'When the damnable heresy of Pelagius had been put down, its agents silenced, and the souls of all settled in purity of faith, the bishops made their way to the blessed Albanus the martyr, to give thanks to God through him.' And then he adds: 'The special merits and mediation of Albanus the martyr afforded them a calm crossing [of the Channel], and in quietness the happy vessel brought back the great men to their waiting people.'

This is the first mention of St Alban. No place is named and no date for the martyrdom, but it is certain that in the year 430 there was a shrine, and the martyr was deemed by bishops from Gaul to be their advocate with God.

For the place, an estimate of the time, and a story of the martyrdom we have to go to Gildas, the monk who about the year 560 writes the history of his country's ruin by the heathen English. Before getting to that sad story of his own times, he reviews the heroic period of persecution under the Emperor Diocletian, in the years following 303:

God who willeth that all men should be saved did not leave Britain full-shrouded in the thick darkness of black night. In the above-mentioned persecution, as we infer, He lit for us the brightest of lights. And the graves of their bones and the places of their martyrdom might now in the minds of beholders excite no small fervour of love to God, had they not, in return for our exceeding wickedness, been lost to our people by the lamentable disruption of the barbarians. I mean Albanus of Verulam, Aaron and Julius, citizens of the City of the Legions, and others of both sexes and in different places who stood fast with the highest courage in the contest for Christ. The first of these . . . for the sake of love, saved another confessor when he was about to be taken, by hiding him in his house, and then changing clothes with him. In this he followed the example of Christ who laid down His life for His sheep.⁷

'City of the Legions'—that is, garrison town—might be used of Chester, York, or Carlisle, but probably '*urbs legionum*' means Caerleon in Monmouthshire. The very name Caerleon is a telescoping of '*castra legionum*'. More decisive, the charter of a church dedicated to 'the holy martyrs Julius and Aaron' can be traced in Caerleon back to about the year 870.⁸ One hears of none other such, and probably this dedication goes back to the time of Gildas, three centuries before. Gildas speaks of Albanus 'of Verulam'; again, no other town claims him.

Just one thing might make us doubt the geography. Among the marvels which Gildas records as the saint went to his death is this: 'He opened a path across the noble River Thames, whose waters stood abrupt like cliffs on either hand.' Verulam is on a small tributary of the Thames, but hardly a noble river.

Still, we need not doubt. Gildas depends on an earlier martyr-story. His knowledge of the place is hearsay. But surely it was this shrine at Verulam at which the bishops Germanus and Lupus had given thanks in the year 430, and this was the scene of Saint Alban's martyrdom.

When? Did you notice Gildas's qualifying clause? 'In Diocletian's persecution, *as we infer*.' He did not know, so how can we? Some indeed have challenged his inference, and on this ground: Eusebius emphatically states that Constantius Chlorus, the Western Caesar, and later Augustus, under whose rule Britain lay, was 'favourable and kind. He took not the smallest part in persecution of the Christians'.⁹ Must we say that Alban and Aaron and Julius, and the others of both sexes, must go back beyond Diocletian's persecution in 303, to Valerian in 260, or Decius in 250?¹⁰ Three considerations make me say, 'No': first, Eusebius is writing in the pro-Christian reign of Constantius's son, Constantine. What more natural than to exaggerate the peace of the Church under Constantine's father? Second, apart from such exaggeration, Eusebius's words need not mean that there were no local incidents, no underlings who persecuted, when persecution was the declared imperial policy. And, third, I cannot recall ever having had to rescue a personage of the Early Church from too *late* a date; a historian's work moves in the opposite direction!

Here then we have found a real saint, a fixed place, a probable date—Albanus, Verulam, soon after 303. Now, what of the story of the martyrdom? Gildas gives some of it, but the fullest account is from Bede, in his *Ecclesiastical History*¹¹ finished in the year 731. We may seem to be turning to a record which, compared with Gildas's 560, is very late. However, Bede's chapter on St Alban has long been recognized as of different style, a unit complete in itself. Gildas depended on an earlier martyr-story, but Bede seems to have lifted the story as it stood, and incorporated it into his text. This was suspected before; in the year 1904 it was proved by Professor Wilhelm Meyer of Göttingen in one of the finest examples of modern historical and literary criticism.¹² Meyer discovered manuscripts of this *Passio Albani*; it survives in three recensions: first the martyr-story, second an epitome of it, and third a re-expansion of the epitome. It was this third, and latest, recension which Bede, and to a less extent Gildas, used. So the first recension cannot be much later than five hundred. There are signs that it was composed in Auxerre. *The Life of Germanus*, written about 480, had mentioned the shrine of St Alban, and no one knew him. Who was this martyr of Britain, so revered by their own great bishop?

But if no one at Auxerre knew about St Alban, how could anyone there write about his martyrdom? Meyer's detailed work on this *Passio Albani* shows that they borrowed extracts from a number of Roman and Gallic martyrologies—a happening belonging to this saint, a conversation attributed to that, a miracle after the manner of still another. Sometimes the very phrasing is retained, and all are transferred to St Alban. Let me outline the story that results:

Alban, a heathen, gives shelter to a Christian priest. His example, and then his instruction, win Alban to the Faith. Soldiers come to arrest the priest, but Alban wears his cloak and gets himself taken. The judge demands his name, but Alban is more concerned to confess his faith. The judge commands him to sacrifice to the gods. Alban answers they are not gods, but devils. He is condemned. Crowds coming to watch the execution fill the river bridge; so Alban,

eager for martyrdom, goes to the riverside, and the water dries up for him to cross. At this the executioner throws down his sword and is converted. On the hilltop an opposite miracle is performed: Alban prays for water and a spring rises close by. Then both Alban and his convert are beheaded. Here let me quote from Bede:

On the twenty-second day of June near to the city of Verulam, which by the English is now called Verlamacaestir or Vaeclingacaestir [the name that we also find in *Watling Street*]. And here when the peace of Christian times returned, a church was built of wonderful workmanship, worthy of this martyr. And in it truly, even to this day, there are ceaselessly fulfilled the healing of the sick and a continuance of good works.

This addition of Bede's *is* history, but you may feel impatient with the made-up items which went before.

They have no value as historical details concerning one individual, but they may have typological value expressing general truths. Let me mention four such:

First, the river made way for the saint to cross. To the Christian death *is* the crossing of the Jordan to the Promised Land.

Second, the spring bubbled up at the place of execution. For the man who prays, the water of God's comfort *is* there in the midst of suffering.

Third, the executioner was himself converted. This is true to the martyr tradition. 'Martyr' is 'witness', and it is this witness which prevails. As Tertullian has said, 'The blood of Christians is seed.'

And last, also true to tradition is that conflict of Alban with his judge, when he tells him his name and family do not matter. I recall that early martyrology—oh, real eyewitness stuff this!¹³—concerning one at Lyons in the year 177: 'He did not tell his own name nor race nor city, nor whether he were slave or free, but to all their questions he returned answer in the Latin language: *Christianus sum.*' Yes, that *is* all that matters.

JOHN FOSTER

¹ *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. II, p.410.

² *Adversus Iudaeos*, 7; see also Origen's *Homilies*, on Ezekiel, 4; on Luke, 6; on Matthew, 28. These are about fifty years later than Tertullian.

³ Hugh Williams, *Christianity in Early Britain*, pp.74-7; the recent Penguin publication, I. A. Richmond, *Roman Britain*, supplements with regard to recent archaeological conclusions, pp. 48-60.

⁴ Hugh Williams, p.201 and note.

⁵ Prologue to Commentary on Jeremiah, Migne, Vol. 24, p.758. The Scots were then in Ireland.

⁶ Constantius of Lyons, *Vita Germani*, c. 480, well summarized in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, article 'Germanus'.

⁷ *De Excidio Britanniae*, 10.

⁸ *Book of Llandav*; see Hugh Williams, p.105.

⁹ *Ecclesiastical History*, VIII.13; still more fulsome praise in *Life of Constantine*, 13-18.

¹⁰ Hugh Williams says we must, pp.102ff.

¹¹ I.7; a welcome recent addition to Penguin Classics.

¹² *Antiquity*, 1941, conclusions outlined in article by W. Levison, pp.337-59.

¹³ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, V.1, incorporating contemporary account from Lyons. This concerns Sanctus, 'a deacon from Vienne'.

THE SAMARITANS AND THEIR LITURGY

IT is often remarked that the continuation of the Israelites into the present day as a separate and distinct nation, with all their peculiarities, both physical and religious, is a very remarkable phenomenon. An even more remarkable phenomenon is the continuation to this present day of the Samaritans. They have lived among the Jews for many centuries, sometimes being persecuted with them, and sometimes by them, but always hating them, as they have been hated in return. They claim to be the true Hebrews (New Testament scholars should note this when they are discussing the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews), and hold that the Jews will share the Day of Vengeance with the Gentiles, whilst they themselves will enjoy the Eden of Yahweh's favour. However they came into existence (whether they are the remnant of the Northern Kingdom, or whether they are the mixed race of 2 Kings 17₂₄), they are different both in physique and physiognomy from the Jews. Today there are about 300 to 350 Samaritans still living in Nablus (Shechem) under the shadow of the blessed Hargerizim (as they always write it). Sacrifices are still made, and pilgrimages are undertaken up and around the mountain at least three times a year—at Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. Antiphonal prayers from their voluminous liturgy are recited as they process, or as they stop at the ancient sites of altars, which still bear the names of the patriarchs.

The Samaritans seem to have appreciated the value of the tourist trade ever since they were 'discovered' in modern times by European scholars and travellers. In AD 1583 Joseph Scaliger visited the Samaritans, and as a result published *De Emendatione Temporum*, which later influenced other scholars to be interested in the Samaritans. In the seventeenth century Pietro della Valle procured a copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Other visitors were received by the Samaritans in the same century, such as Huntingdon, Maundell, and Morrison. In the first decade of the nineteenth century Gregoire was in touch with them, and later Robinson (1838 and 1852) made journeys to visit them. In 1853 Petermann made contact with them. An unfortunate result of some of these visits was the giving to the Samaritans the impression that Britons were their brothers (British Israelites will be interested). After Petermann many tourists and scholars visited them, and gradually a great quantity and variety of manuscripts was revealed, and still is being revealed. Some of these manuscripts (none really old) have been purchased, and they are now in libraries in various parts of the world, and some have been transcribed, or photographed, whilst still in the possession of the Samaritans. The manuscripts are varied in character—biblical, liturgical, commentating, and theological. Perhaps the most complete collection of them is being made by Leeds University, where the Semitic Department has hundreds of actual manuscripts, and microfilm of manuscripts held by other owners. Fifty years ago Montgomery said in his *The Samaritans*: 'This extensive material has by no means been worked out, although it has gained the interest of many Semitists . . . such as Gesenius, Kuenen, Noldeke, Kohn, Neubauer . . . Cowley and many others. . . .' Within two years of Montgomery's saying this, A. E. Cowley published his most carefully prepared text covering most of the Liturgy, having minutely examined all the more important manuscripts available at the time. With the publication of

this work (*The Samaritan Liturgy*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1909), Cowley made a tremendous stride forward in Samaritan studies. Parts of the Liturgy had already been published by Gesenius and Heidenheim and a few others, but, as he says in his Introduction, 'these are mostly isolated hymns'. Cowley goes on to claim that Heidenheim's collection, which was then the most extensive, is very inaccurate, both in text and translation. He also indicates that little, if any, comparison and criticism of manuscripts had been undertaken in preparation for the printed texts, or in the making of the translations. In comparison with what had been done before, Cowley's work was a gigantic effort. Working for nearly twenty years (on and off), he edited a nearly complete text of the whole Liturgy, using well over sixty manuscripts, many of which were almost unreadable in parts. Doubtlessly Cowley planned a translation of his text, which took him so long to edit, but he never accomplished that task.

Little constructive work had been done before Cowley's time. Translations were of isolated hymns made from single manuscripts, which, when added up, were very slight compared with the tremendous bulk of hymns, prayers and other pieces which go to make up the Samaritan Liturgy. Since Cowley's time, comparatively little has been done in the field of Samaritan studies, apart from the collecting of more and more manuscripts. Kahle published a few Marqah hymns in 1928 in German. We are indebted to Dr E. Robertson for his detailed *The Catalogue of the Samaritan Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library at Manchester* (Aberdeen, 1938), which covers the Crawford collection of Samaritan manuscripts, some of which were available to Cowley. Gaster, who on one occasion claimed to have seen and examined every available Samaritan manuscript, made a great collection himself. These were not available to Cowley. The scholar best informed about the Samaritans and their manuscripts is perhaps Dr John Bowman of Leeds University, who has made a fine collection of manuscripts, actual or in microfilm.

It will thus be seen that two things remain to be done. First there remains to be made a translation of the whole Liturgy. Isolated hymns are better than nothing, but for a proper appreciation of the Liturgy a complete translation is necessary. Then there still remains the job of examining and listing the many manuscripts which have come to light since Cowley made his survey and Robertson published his catalogue.

The Samaritan Liturgy consists of literally hundreds of Services for the great festivals, and for such special occasions as weddings and funerals. It begins with a Book of Common Prayer (the *Old Defter*), reference to which is made a thousand times in the liturgy proper by the quotation of the first phrase of the prayer to be said, e.g.: 'Then there is said Durran's "The King who is above all kings".' Either this prayer would be known by the congregation, or they would turn to their *Defter*, and find it there. The Liturgy is arranged in Series of Services. For instance, there is the Series for Shabuot (Pentecost). The Series consists of some twenty-five Services: Morning Services and Noon Services for the Six Sabbaths of Shabuot, a Service for the Tuesday Night before Pentecost, one for Wednesday Morning, another for Friday Night (of the same week), two services for the Seventh Sabbath, the Morning Service for the Sunday (Harvest, Weeks, or Pentecost), and various shorter Services for the Going-out of the Festivals and Sabbaths.

It is doubtful if the whole of the Liturgy will ever be published in full because of its very great length. The Liturgy includes the Scripture readings, which are very long and a peculiarity of Samaritan usage. They are referred to as *qatafim*, which may mean 'selected' or 'strung together', and fairly accurately indicates their nature. Sometimes the selections which are strung together consist of a whole verse, sometimes part of a verse, and sometimes just one word; apparently the reader went on and on, and often his reading made no sense at all, apart from those places where the *qataf* included a whole verse. The reason for this unusual practice is not fully understood. Certainly a central idea is to be found in each 'lesson', and certain words are left out, and others put in, when the same *qataf* is used on different festivals. Then there are special *qatafim* for special occasions, and also such *qatafim* as that of the Righteous Ones, in which every reference to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (together) in the Pentateuch is recited in absolute order and with no omission at all, and that of the Blessings, in which every portion of scripture using the word 'bless' as noun or verb, is recited. The following example comes from the *qataf* of the Righteous Ones:

But God will surely visit you and bring you up out of this land unto the land which he sware to Abraham to Isaac and to Jacob and God remembered His covenant with Abraham with Isaac and with Jacob moreover He said I am the God of thy father the God of Abraham the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob O God their God O God their Lord etc. God is to be praised there is no god but one.

It can be worked out that the references are Genesis 50²⁴, Exodus 2²⁴, and Exodus 3⁶, together with a typically Samaritan exclamation. These *qatafim* go on for a very long time. There are no grammatical indications as to where one reference ends and another begins.

It may well be that a full translation of the Prayers of the Liturgy has not yet been made because of the difficulties of the translation. For many of the services there is no Arabic translation. It is true that Cowley has included a most useful and helpful little glossary in his *Samaritan Liturgy*, but this is really only for the *Defter*, and it by no means covers all the difficulties encountered later in the Liturgy itself. It is interesting to see what two translators have said about the language of the Liturgy. In 1874, John Nutt said in *Fragments of a Samaritan Targum*:

It is probable that even before the captivity of the Ten Tribes, the closer intercourse which has sprung up between them and the neighbouring Aramaean nations had already had some influence upon the Hebrew of Northern and Central Palestine. Other elements besides Aramaic are observable in the language . . . foreign words . . . Greek, Latin, Persian, Arabic, and possibly other languages as well have contributed something to enrich the vocabulary. The grammar bears all the signs of irregularity which would characterize that of an illiterate people, the orthography is uncertain, there is a profusion of quiescents, and a complete confusion between the several gutturals and cognate letters respectively: the vowels are uncertain, the 'A' sound being most prominent. Such is the dialect spoken in Samaria till the Arabian conquest of the country in the seventh century A.D., when the language of the victors was introduced . . . and by the eighth or ninth century had taken its place. The old language, however, still continued to be understood and written by the priests, so that, like the

Jews, they had two sacred languages, which, however, they had not the skill completely to distinguish from each other. The 'Hebrew' which appears in the correspondence of the Samaritans with Europeans is largely impregnated with Aramaisms: Arabisms are also not by any means infrequent.

It is a little disconcerting when we read later on in the same book that in the opinion of the one who could so aptly cover the difficulties encountered in the language: 'The Hymns of the Samaritans are of little devotional or literary value'! Writing (1955) of the *Old Defter* in particular, Dr S. Brown says: 'The language of the Prayers is fraught with obscurities, grammatical irregularities, and other peculiarities associated with Samaritan Aramaic which leaves the translator in doubt as to the exact thought the writer wishes to convey'.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, much of the Liturgy and most of the *Defter* has been translated by various students in the Leeds School of Samaritan Studies under the vigorous guidance of Dr Bowman. As Dr Brown says: 'The translation offered, although not conclusive, is an attempt at a presentation of a readable translation based upon known grammatical rules and the glossary of words listed by Cowley'. It should perhaps be added that the language is not as consistently difficult in the Liturgy as that encountered in the *Old Defter*. Some of the hymns are written in simple biblical Hebrew, and some of the hymns are really little more than quotations taken from the Pentateuch and strung together, retaining the familiar language of the ancient law.

There are metre and rhyme to be found in many of the hymns, though in most of them the metre is not strictly adhered to. Cowley says: 'Strange forms are frequently invented by most writers for the sake of the rhyme, and a word may even be divided for the same reason between two lines.' In many cases of difficulty in translation, the temptation is to brush aside the problem by asserting that the strange form is due to the author's passion for rhyme at all costs. In many cases this may be so, but this presumption should only be made when all other possibilities have been completely exhausted. Alphabetical arrangements and acrostic forms are fairly common in the prayers, and authors often pick out their names and lineage with the first letters of the opening lines. This practice has little effect upon the contents of the hymns, apart from making necessary the introduction of a strange or unexpected idea or phrase in order to get a letter with which to open the line, and to maintain the alphabetical arrangement.

Much can be learned about the Samaritan theology and beliefs by a study of the Liturgy. There is only space here to mention that the Samaritans have a respect and love for the Law only equalled by that of the Jews. They quote their Law (the Pentateuch is the extent of their Holy Scriptures) on every possible and on many impossible occasions. Much of their Liturgy is direct quotation of appropriate portions of scripture; the *qatafim* are extensive, as we have seen; and their hymns are based on scripture and contain many direct quotations. Many of the fascinating and ancient traditions to be found in Jewish writings are also encountered in the Liturgy. The Samaritan Creed, which is known from other sources, is also fully revealed on almost every page of the Liturgy, with all its five points amply illustrated and made plain. That the Decalogue is held in supreme regard by the Samaritans, as by the Jews, is

clearly indicated in almost every hymn, for it is quoted many times, either in full or in one of several almost stereotyped abbreviated forms.

In the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (1894) Cowley said:

The interest of the compositions [i.e. the Samaritan compositions] consists not in their antiquity, for the earliest date that can be certainly assigned to any is the fourth century C.E., but in the view they present of the religious development of an obscure tribe surrounded by conflicting religious systems, and yet holding aloof from all.

What Cowley said about the compositions he was dealing with can be said about the whole of the Liturgy. It is a most remarkable compilation of Scripture and hymns and poems, which has grown larger and larger with the passing of the centuries. It is to be hoped that before the passing of too many years this corner of the world's literature will be made available to a wider public by the publication of the full translation.

DONALD J. BOYS

THE DIVINE IMAGE IN DYLAN THOMAS

I WANT to begin my essay on the image of God in the work of Dylan Thomas by referring to a brief blasphemy contained in his book of short stories, *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Dog*. In one of these tales entitled 'The Peaches', the poet as a young boy goes to stay with his uncle in the country. His cousin, who is studying for the ministry, practises preaching in his father's barn, and conscripts the young Dylan into attending one of these sermons.

O God [he tells his very select congregation], Thou art everywhere all the time, in the dew of the morning, in the frost of the evening, in the field and the town, in the preacher and the sinner, in the sparrow and the big buzzard. Thou canst see everything, right down deep in our hearts; . . . Thou canst see everything we do, in the night and day, in the day and the night, everything, everything; Thou canst see all the time. O God, mun, you're like a bloody cat.

I have called this passage blasphemous, but 'irreverent' is perhaps a better word. The concluding simile is certainly one we would not expect to hear from an actual pulpit. Yet, at the same time, we cannot deny the seeming sincerity of it. Those who are deeply intimate with us will sometimes be familiar in their

speech. Between close friends or a man and his wife, an unrelieved formality of address is not so much a proof of courtesy as a symptom of lack of trust. And so it is for some with God. Feeling the proximity of His being, they will take certain liberties which long acquaintance warrants. St Teresa of Avilla was travelling once with a school of nuns when they were overtaken by a thunderstorm and soaked. 'O Lord,' cried the saint, 'can You wonder You have so few friends when this is how You treat them.'

The act of taking someone for granted, disrespectful as it may appear, confirms our sense of a person's reality. This comes out in a note which Dylan Thomas wrote to his *Collected Poems*: a jaunty, casual, sincere expression of faith.

I read somewhere [Dylan Thomas says] of a shepherd who, when asked why he made, from within fairy rings, ritual observances to the moon to protect his flocks, replied: 'I'd be a damn' fool if I didn't!' These poems, with all their crudities, doubts, and confusions, are written for the love of man and in praise of God, and I'd be a damn' fool if they weren't.

But I think we can extract from the first passage quoted some further indications of Thomas's notion of deity. 'O God, Thou are everywhere all the time,' Cousin Gwilym begins his sermon, 'in the dew of the morning, in the frost of the evening, in the field and the town.' This is as clear a statement of immanence as one could desire. Here it is put into the mouth of a young man training for the ministry, and the sentiment informing the statement therefore assumes a theological dress. But in most of Thomas's poems the speaker (who is very often a mask for the poet) is not figured as a convinced Christian. What we get in these cases, then, is the same sentiment of God's everywhere-ness in terms not specifically Christian.

Now, the philosophical equivalent of the idea of immanence, expressed in non-Christian terms, is pantheism, a belief which—in Bertrand Russell's definition—'holds that God and the world are not distinct and that everything in the world is part of God.' There is no need to emphasize the likeness and difference in the ideas of immanence and pantheism. The main distinction for Christians consists in that where pantheism recognizes a constant multiple incarnation of God through every form in nature, immanence believes that God was incarnate once only in His Son, Jesus Christ. This is to simplify very drastically, but perhaps it will help us to tackle the poetry.

As an illustration of the pantheistic notion operating in a quite elementary fashion, I should like to quote the following verses:

*All all and all the dry worlds lever,
Stage of the ice, the solid ocean,
All from the oil, the pound of lava.
City of spring, the governed flower,
Turns in the earth that turns the ashen
Towns around on a wheel of fire.*

Here Thomas is saying that everything in the universe ('all all and all' as his repetition puts it; and then, in more extended terms, 'ice', 'ocean', 'spring',

'flower') is 'levered' into being and depends upon the primal cosmic energy and fuel for its birth and maintenance—'the oil' and 'the pound of lava'.

In this poem there is no mention made of God, but we must not look at it as an expression of purely biological materialism. In pantheism there is no distinction between the realms of matter and spirit. Matter *is* spirit, and there is no spirit without the body of matter. So in another piece of his—the Author's Prologue to his *Collected Poems*—Thomas, describing the 'animals thick as thieves/On God's rough tumbling grounds,' salutes the divinity in this form of life with the daring phrase, 'Hail to His beasthood!'

Generally we think of pantheistic poetry as being the bearer of good tidings; as confirming us, imaginatively at least, in our dim sense of kinship and union, by means of which we partake the more of God. This is the simple, undifferentiated, sacramental notion of pantheistic thought; and it is one which we can trace in many religions of the world: in the Dionysic cults of Greece, in the recurrent worship of mother goddesses, and in the animal deities of Egypt. Central to this pantheistic faith is the feeling that matter is creative—that the emergent principle or spirit works directly and inwardly through it.

But in Thomas's poems the pantheistic notion is often presented as a cause for grief. Matter is seen as being informed by the spirit of self-destruction, by the spirit of a final inanition and waste. I quote one of his most famous pieces in which this expenditure without renewal is metaphorically set forth:

*The force that through the green fuse drives the flower
Drives my green age; that blasts the root of trees
Is my destroyer.
And I am dumb to tell the crooked rose
My youth is bent by the same wintry fever.*

*The force that drives the water through the rocks
Drives my red blood; that dries the mounting streams
Turns mine to wax.
And I am dumb to mouth unto my veins
How at the mountain spring the same mouth sucks.*

What Thomas pictures here is something opposed to all those ideas of recurrence, evolution, or redemption which men have entertained of the future. In this poem, his attitude has most in common with those nineteenth-century scientists who thought of the universe as a running-down clock or as a pot of boiling water losing its heat and freezing into ice.

This flaw in Thomas's pantheism, I think, we can trace back to the first quotation. 'O God, Thou art everywhere,' preaches young Gwilym; but over against this motive of God's omnipresence we have the further one of His omniscience; of His all-seeing-ness, and this is not without its disturbing side: 'Thou canst see everything we do, in the night and day, in the day and the night, everything, everything.' In this conclusion of Gwilym's sermon there is a note of exasperation that one cannot get away from God; that always, without let-up, His eye is upon us; and this, for the sinner, implies a sense of guilt.

Such, I believe, is the Christian source of Thomas's 'guilty' pantheism. It is not easy to lose the sense of sin and judgement once we have had it. Of

course, the names may change by which we refer to them, but the sentiment of grief or anxiety remains. Thus, the man who discards the thought of sin as an antiquated concept may transfer his personal flaw to the idea of a faulty universe. Briefly, I think this is what Thomas does in the last stanzas quoted, but he does it with something of a difference.

The point which Thomas is making differs both from the Christian position and that of the man who feels himself a virtuous being in a hostile universe. The Christian says, 'Yes; mine is the sin. If man hadn't chosen evil in Eden, there would have been no Fall. The universe itself was well enough designed.' In contrast to this, we have the person who says, 'Humanity is all right. It is only its fight against a cruel nature which makes man appear sinful. It is really the universe which planned itself wrongly, or was moulded indifferently to man's existence.'

But Thomas's attitude is distinct from either of these:

*The force that through the green fuse drives the flower
Is my destroyer.*

Man, as Thomas regards him, is just a part of the universe. He is not a being distinguishable from it. Man and flower share the same life-force, and flower and man suffer the same fate. Both man and his cosmos are subject to this flaw: to this flowering followed by exhaustion and death. The law of diminishing returns conditions the life of them both. All this, quite naturally, is admitted by the Christian; but whereas the latter goes on from this point of bodily destruction to place his faith in the future of the soul, Thomas stops at the stage of death. Spirit and body are to be identified; and the end of one is the end of the other. This is, sketchily, what I mean when I speak of Thomas's 'guilty' pantheism.

In his *Apologia*, John Henry Newman speaks of the sense of some vast aboriginal calamity, by which one might explain the suffering in the world, and the long history of that suffering, even if one did not accept the Christian story. This was a feeling which Thomas could not evade in his poetry. He wrote, he says, 'for the love of man', but man, like the universe, was born with a flaw. In his poem, 'Before I Knocked', a child as yet unconceived speaks of its premonition of Fate and pain in its life to come:

*As yet ungotten, I did suffer;
The rack of dreams my lily bones
Did twist into a living cipher,
And flesh was snipped to cross the lines
Of gallow crosses on the liver
And brambles in the wringing brains*

Thomas's 'guilty' pantheism is clearly, we see, of a tragic order.

That the poet in his pantheism should not have been able to forget the Old Testament God of judgement may, to Christians, appear a good thing. Man, as the pantheist insists, is certainly one with the body of nature. At the same time, he must never forget that he is the head of that natural body, the apex-member of that living hierarchy. To vacate this commanding and responsible position is to slip back into the stream of sensation without judgement, of vitality without

values, which only the animal world can know. The image of Jehovah preached in Welsh chapels was always at the back of Thomas's mind, stopping him from taking the last plunge. Guilt, however vague, however vicariously expressed, was the Christian life-line in his case.

On the other hand, we must remember that part of what Thomas wished to escape was not the Lord of Hosts, but certain of His sanctimonious agents. Between religion and religiosity we must make a very real distinction. In his poem, 'I have longed to move Away', Thomas is defying the forces of convention and respectability which so often present themselves as true workers in the Christian cause. In the first part of the poem he speaks of his horror of church-going, which he sees as a kind of bourgeois parade:

*I have longed to move away
From the hissing of the spent lie
And the old terrors' continual cry
Growing more terrible as the day
Goes over the hill into the deep sea;
I have longed to move away
From the repetition of salutes,
For there are ghosts in the air
And ghostly echoes on paper,
And the thunder of calls and notes.*

But even in his defiance he cannot escape his guilt, his sense of deliberately avoiding God. False as the show of chapel-going seems, there may still be some truth in it he thinks. The next four lines in the poem describe his dilemma:

*I have longed to move away but am afraid;
Some life, yet unspent, might explode
Out of the old lie burning on the ground,
And, crackling into the air, leave me half-blind.*

Thomas's sense of guilt was prolonged, I believe, because he confused the central Christian truths with the mealy-mouthed morality of many congregations. He was loath to think that submission to God might mean a victory for the armies of cant.

Even when Thomas appeared to be evading the invisible net-work of God's presence, a part of his mind was anchored still in the memorable bay of Biblical language. The refrain of his exalted poem, 'And Death shall have No Dominion', comes from St Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. The fact that he should have intuitively resorted to Christian speech in order to arrive at the poem's pantheistic conclusion is important.

For many years Thomas had been a great reader and admirer of Francis Thompson, author of *The Hound of Heaven*, and I think the poem's principal 'baroque' image of God as a spiritual Hound of the Baskervilles, as terrible as He is merciful, chasing the ever-fleeing sinner, registered deeply on Thomas's mind. The end of this chase we find reproduced in his remarkable poem, ostensibly about the birth of a child, entitled 'Vision and Prayer'. Here the Hound of Heaven is featured as the sun, but this is clearly not a Mithraic reference, since it is described as 'Christening' down the sky. I quote the last stanza:

*I turn the corner of prayer and burn
 In a blessing of the sudden
 Sun. In the name of the damned
 I would turn back and run
 To the hidden land
 But the loud sun
 Christens down
 The sky*

*I
 Am found
 O let him
 Scald me and drown
 Me in his world's wound.
 His lightning answers my
 Cry. My voice burns in his hand.
 Now I am lost in the blinding
 One. The sun roars at the prayer's end.*

It is extremely difficult to say how far a poet is committed to God. As a man, he may suffer or reject conversion; yet either of these decisions may leave little trace upon his work. What I mean is, that his imagination may be touched by religious images and symbols, irrespective of his lack or possession of faith. Reasonably, we may expect that the continued use of such symbols and images indicates a personal concern with their nature as well as a figurative attraction to them.

If we turn our attention from the poem to the poet, to ask from what psychological condition this ambiguous poetry proceeds, we can risk the following conjecture. Whereas some make intellectual assent to the notion of God, without their imaginations taking fire from the idea, there are others whose imagination assents but whose intelligence boggles at the notion. It is possible that Thomas was of the latter class. Intellectually, I think he stayed anchored in some form of vague, if 'guilty', pantheism. Certainly there remained in his mind an over-close identification of God with man, and God with nature. In a wireless broadcast on an unfinished poem, Thomas speaks of the Deity, who was to feature in this composition, as 'The godhead, the author, the milky-way farmer, the first cause, architect, lamplighter, quintessence, the beginning Word, the anthropomorphic bowler-out and blackballer, the stuff of all men, scapegoat, martyr, maker, woe-bearer'. But in the Author's Prologue and 'In Country Sleep' Thomas got nearer to God than in this half-humorous list of definitions.

Most theologians are apt to overstress one or another of the aspects of God's being, which are best thought of as synchronized and complementary. Either they accent His immanence—His pervasion of the universe and presence here with us; or they emphasize His transcendence—His distinction from the universe and spiritual distance from us. The same, I think, can probably be said of poets in their imagining of God. Either they picture Him too near or too far.

In part, this seems to have been Thomas's error: that God for him was all immanence, a revelation in terms of earthly nearness, without the corrective of

heavenly remoteness, of utterly different non-human existence. So, of the work he planned to write, which was to be called 'In Country Heaven', he tells us that 'the poem becomes an affirmation of the beautiful and terrible worth of the earth'. So, too, in one of his last pieces he wrote:

*the closer I move
To death, one man through his sundered hulks,
The louder the sun blooms
And the tusked, ramshackling sea exalts.*

But Thomas's notion of God's presence, for all its limitation, is intense in expression. His whole work endorses the mysticism of Thomas Traherne, who maintained that—

Your enjoyment of the World is never right, till you so esteem it, that everything in it, is more your treasure than a King's exchequer full of Gold and Silver. And that exchequer yours also in its place and service. Can you take too much joy in your Father's works? He is Himself in everything.

Like Traherne, Thomas remembered a time 'when the dust of the street was as pleasing as gold to my . . . eyes'. To have helped us to see this dust as gold is part of the common glory of these authors.

DEREK STANFORD

THE WHOLE DUTY OF MAN

A BOOK WHICH, with the Bible and the *Book of Common Prayer*, formed the library of certain devout Christians 300 years ago was *The Whole Duty of Man*. Copies may still be obtained for a few shillings in second-hand bookshops.

It is a controversial book in more than one respect. First, because of the uncertainty of its authorship; and, secondly, because of the division of opinion about its value.

The question of authorship is exceedingly interesting. The first edition appeared anonymously. Because it bore the imprimatur of H. Hammond, who says that he very willingly 'read over all the sheets, both of the Discourse, and the Devotions annexed', it was believed that the book came from the home of Lady Dorothy Packington, in which he was then living. Moreover, Lady

Packington's reputation as a woman of great learning, wide reading, and piety supported the conjecture. There is evidence in letters from her to Bishop Morley, which have been preserved, that she was possessed of literary ability.

It was not until 1697, eighteen years after her death, that the first public reference to her authorship was made. Dr George Hickes dedicated to her grandson his Anglo-Saxon and Maeso-Gothic grammar in his *Linguarum Septentrionalium*. Hickes declared that Lady Packington's practical piety, talents, and excellence in composition entitled her to be called and esteemed the authoress of *The Whole Duty of Man*. This view is supported in a pamphlet published in 1702, *A Letter from a Clergyman in the Country*, where it is asserted that Archbishop Dolben, Bishop Fell and Dr Allestree all agreed from their knowledge that, although Lady Packington would not let it be known during her lifetime, the book was written by her.

The authorship was evidently a matter of conjecture at the time it first appeared, and for years afterwards. In 1698 a clergyman named Caulton declared on his death-bed that Mrs Eyre, a daughter of Lady Packington, had nine years before shown him a manuscript of the book in her mother's handwriting. This manuscript has never been seen since, and is now regarded as a copy made by Lady Packington from the original before its publication.

There are reasons for rejecting the belief that the book is the work of Lady Packington. Fell, who certainly knew something of the secret, as we shall see later, says in the Preface to the collected works of the author of *The Whole Duty of Man*, published in 1684, that these were all the work of one author, now deceased. Moreover, he speaks of the author in the masculine gender. Mrs Eyre, on the other hand, declared that only *The Whole Duty of Man* and one other attributed to the same author—that is, *The Causes of the Decay of Christian Piety*—were written by her mother.

The book has been attributed to many other persons, such as Archbishop Sterne, Bishop Fell, Bishop Henchman, Bishop Chappell of Cork, Abraham Woodhead, Obadiah Walker, Archbishop Frewin, William Fulman, and Richard Allestree.

Students of this problem point out that the language in *The Whole Duty of Man* and the other books attributed to the same author is that of a practised divine as well as a scholar. There is evidence too that the writer had a knowledge of Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic, as well as Greek and Latin. In the *Lively Oracles*, published in 1678, there is a reference which suggests that the author had travelled in 'popish countries' among those 'whom the late troubles or other occasions sent abroad'.

These, and other considerations, support the view expressed by W. D. Macray in his note on Lady Packington in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, that Richard Allestree was the author of the book and all others attributed to the same person.

Richard Allestree (1619-81) was an English divine who took up arms for Charles I at the outbreak of the Civil War. After the war he took holy orders, and during the Commonwealth was an agent for the King. Before the Parliamentary Visitors of the University of Oxford, on 5th May 1648, he refused to submit to the authority of Parliament and was expelled from the University. On the death of Lord Newport in France, Allestree was sent across to 'clear accounts,

and to see if anything could be preserved from the inhospitable pretence of the *droit d'Aubaine*, which pillages those strangers who happen to die in the French dominion'. It may be this visit to which reference is made in the *Lively Oracles*.

On his return from this visit he was made a messenger of the King, and in this capacity made other visits to France. The winter before the Restoration, he was returning from Flanders with the King's instructions for filling up vacant bishoprics when he was arrested at Dover and brought to London. There he was tried by the Committee of the Council of Safety and imprisoned at Lambeth Palace.

After six to eight weeks he was released. He went first to Shropshire, and then decided to spend a little while with his friend, Dr H. Hammond, at Westwood, near Worcester. At the gate of his friend's house he met a cortège: Dr Hammond had died. He had left Allestree his library, and their perpetual friendship was further marked by Hammond's commendation of *The Whole Duty of Man*.

Allestree received his Doctorate of Divinity at the Restoration, in 1663 he was appointed Chaplain to the King, and two years later was made Provost of Eton. This foundation had been seriously neglected during the period of the Commonwealth. Chiefly through the labours of Dr Allestree, it was resuscitated.

He was the author of a number of works, including volumes of sermons. With Abraham Woodhead and Obadiah Walker, he published *A Paraphrase and Annotation upon All the Epistles of St Paul*. It is thought by some that Bishop Fell also had a hand in this publication.

Mention of Bishop Fell introduces another name into the controversy over the authorship of *The Whole Duty of Man*. It is contended by some students of this problem that Bishop Fell joined with Allestree in writing the books published under the name of the author of *The Whole Duty of Man*.

There is a letter from Dr Allestree to Bishop Fell (Sloane MS. No. 4,275) in reply to a request from Fell that, as his literary executor, he might publish some of his works. Allestree replies that he is dissatisfied with some of them, as he had no time for revision, he could not consent to their publication as an authoritative expression of the writer's views. However, he did give Fell permission to make use of the manuscripts.

Bishop Fell (1625-86) was spoken of as 'the most zealous man of his time for the Church of England and none . . . did go beyond him in the performance of the rules belonging thereto'. Although he was a staunch opponent of popery, he had no sympathy for Dissenters. He published among other things *The Life of Dr Henry Hammond*, and he did much to extend the Oxford University Press.

Prideaux thought Fell was the author of *Reasons for the Decay of Christian piety*, which was attributed to the unknown author of *The Whole Duty of Man*, and published with his other tracts in 1704.

The extensive investigation of the problem of the authorship may be said to have been concluded by the publication of two articles. The first appeared in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* for July 1864, where the arguments in favour of Allestree were convincingly set forth. Then Mr C. E. Doble carried out an investigation, chiefly of the style and language of *The Whole Duty of Man* and

other relevant literature. The results of his enquiries were published in three articles in the *Academy* for November 1884; these, again, support the contention that Allestree was the author.

The original book was published in more than thirty editions, a fact which indicates how widely it was read and appreciated. More thoughtful readers saw that its weakness was the extent to which it dealt with externalities to the neglect of the inner life of man. It was a recognition of this that led to its revision.

The *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature* gives an account of the many revisions of the original work and the new editions which appeared. The first attempt to remedy the weakness already referred to was made in 1693, when another anonymous writer issued *The Whole Duty of Man, Part II: Teaching a Christian how to Prepare Himself for a Happy Death*. This revision was not adequate, and in 1704 a shorter and more acceptable treatise by Robert Nelson was published. It was much appreciated and ran into many editions. Then in 1717 Dr Browne Willis produced a summary of the original work which was followed by yet another publication in 1729. Finally, in 1744 another anonymous writer published *The New Whole Duty of Man, containing the Faith as well as the Practice of a Christian, with Devotions proper for Several Occasions; also an Help to Reading the Scriptures*. This was so widely appreciated that more than forty editions of this work have appeared.

Even after the eighteenth-century revival of religion, the original *Whole Duty of Man* continued to exercise a wide influence. Thus, a demand for a work which would embody the Evangelical theology was met by Henry Venn's publication in 1763 of a book with the significant title—*The Complete Duty of Man*. This book, revised and improved from time to time, appeared in nearly twenty editions.

Earlier we said that *The Whole Duty of Man* was a controversial book, not only because of the uncertainty of its authorship, but also because of the division of opinion as to its value. It is to this second matter that we must now give some consideration.

Amongst certain devout Anglicans it came to be regarded with almost reverential awe. John Wesley in his Oxford days must have made personal use of it, because the members of the Holy Club were encouraged to give to the hungry, naked, and sick, 'if they can read, a Bible, Common Prayer-Book, or *Whole Duty of Man*'. In the same instructions to the Holy Club, Wesley enquired: 'Whether we may not supply as many as are serious enough to read, with a Bible and *Whole Duty of Man*?'

After their evangelical experience the attitude of the Methodists changed towards this book. Whitefield's uncompromising judgement was that it had sent thousands to hell! Wesley was more moderate. In the *Journal* for Sunday, 20th July 1740, he describes how a zealous man freed him from the noisy, careless hearers—'(or spectators rather)'—at Moorfields, 'by reading, meanwhile, at a small distance, a chapter in *The Whole Duty of Man*. I wish neither he nor they may ever read a worse book; though I can tell them of a better—the Bible.' He finally included it in his 'Christian Library'.

This book cannot be said to have exerted a great influence on the Wesleys or the members of their Societies, but it contains certain elements to be found in Methodist discipline and devotion, as indeed in all true piety. This is to be

seen in the purpose stated for the book, and in the way it is set out. The Preface confronts the reader immediately with the great priority of life—"The necessity of caring for the soul". This is the motive of all religious observance and discipline, and is the sure defence against sin. 'Carelessness of the soul', it is declared, 'is the root of all the sin we commit.' Clearly, then, the 'whole duty of man' is to care for his soul, and this duty is fulfilled in 'the hearty, honest endeavour of obeying the whole will of God'.

The Whole Duty of Man sets out what, in the author's view, are the several things God now requires of us. First, there are some things we know to be our duty to God, though we have never been told in Scripture; these we discern by 'the light of nature'. There are other things which Scripture alone tells us to be our duty to God. These are chiefly contained in the Ten Commandments and in the Sermon on the Mount.

From these essential preliminary considerations the author turns to a more detailed account of man's duty to God, and this under three heads—our duty to God, to ourselves, and to our neighbours. The book is set out in seventeen chapters, and the instruction is added that one chapter should be read every Lord's Day, so that the whole may be read three times in the year. There is added a section of 'Private Devotions for Several Occasions', which consists of various prayers for morning and evening, some Christian graces, an interesting collection of 'pious ejaculations taken out of the Book of Psalms', and various prayers for public occasions. Of special interest is what might be described as 'a spiritual check-up', but in this book is called—"Heads of Self-Examination"; these are divided into three sections on the plan of the 'foregoing treatise'—that is, 'To God', 'To ourselves', and 'To our neighbours'.

What value has this book 300 years after its publication? Apart from the interest it has for the student of devotional classics, it has two things to say to Christians of the twentieth century.

First, the confidence with which the publisher commends the book, and the many editions through which it passed, are proof that the Christians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries felt their need of instruction as to their duty to God. This is a rebuke to the indiscipline of our personal and corporate religious life today. There is in our time no widespread demand for the kind of instruction given here and in the Puritan devotional classics of the same period.

Secondly, the kind of publication of which *The Whole Duty of Man* is representative was the work of men and women who were experienced in the practice of the disciplined life. *The Whole Duty of Man* was a 'catholic' publication, but in the eighteenth century there was a Henry Venn to produce the evangelical counterpart. Today, the catholic movement continues to produce helpful literature for those who need instruction in their duty to God, but the Free Churches do not seem to be providing the kind of books that encourage the disciplined life which found expression in Puritanism and Methodism.

G. THOMPSON BRAKE

JOHN WESLEY'S LECTIONARY

With notes on some later Methodist Lectionaries

REGULAR SCRIPTURE readings were introduced into Christian worship in England by St Augustine, and (apart from the Eucharist) were confined to the early morning service which later acquired the name of Mattins. They followed the ecclesiastical year, and the volume which contained them was called the *Lectionarius*. But long before the Reformation, as Cranmer wrote in the Preface to the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*:

this godly and decent order of the ancient fathers hath been so altered, broken, and neglected . . . that commonly when any Book of the Bible was begun, before three or four Chapters were read out, all the rest were unread.¹

This was one of the 'inconveniences' which Cranmer resolved to redress, and his Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 contained the first systematic Lectionary for the regular daily reading of the English Bible at Morning and Evening Prayer.

And for a readiness in this matter, here is drawn out a Kalendar for that purpose, which is plain and easy to be understood, wherein (so much as may be) the reading of holy scripture is so set forth, that all things shall be done in order, without breaking one piece thereof from another.²

Cranmer's Lectionary mainly followed not the ecclesiastical but the civil year, and made provision for the Scriptures to be read 'in course' throughout the year on Sundays and weekdays alike. In this way he achieved, and the Church of England inherited, a simplicity which ensured that the Bible should be both read and known. Cranmer's scheme, with the addition of proper lessons for Sundays (provided by the Act of Uniformity in 1559), remained virtually unaltered in the 1662 Prayer Book, and was not superseded until 1871, when an entirely new Lectionary was devised.

'THE SUNDAY SERVICE OF THE METHODISTS'

With this necessary introduction, we now approach our main theme. The early Methodists were prohibited by John Wesley from holding services during the hours of divine worship in the parish church. Their services in the preaching-houses were informal and (except for the sermon) brief, and the selection of Scripture readings was left to the discretion of the preacher. At the 'New Chapel' in City Road, London, which John S. Simon called a 'distinct ecclesiastical community', services were held in church hours, and there the *Book of Common Prayer* was used and the appointed lessons read.

In 1784, however, Wesley prepared and published *The Sunday Service of the Methodists in North America*. This was his abridgement of the *Book of Common Prayer*, designed for the use of the American Methodists, and taken to America by Thomas Coke after his consecration as 'superintendent' in September 1784. Other editions of this book for use in America and in 'His Majesty's

Dominions' followed in 1786, and also an edition entitled simply *The Sunday Service of the Methodists*. This was the first of over thirty editions intended primarily for use in this country, and its contents (which I have described fully elsewhere³) remained substantially unaltered until its final appearance in 1910. It was the book referred to in that section of the Plan of Pacification of 1795 which laid down the conditions under which Methodist services could be held in church hours. Article 10 reads:

Wherever Divine service is performed in England on the Lord's day in Church-hours, the officiating preacher shall read either the service of the Established Church, our venerable father's abridgement, or, at least, the lessons appointed by the Calendar. But we recommend either the full service, or the abridgement.

The long history of 'our venerable father's abridgement' is largely obscure, but such evidence as we have indicates that it never superseded the *Book of Common Prayer* in the affection of the Methodist people.

JOHN WESLEY'S LECTIONARY IN THE 'SUNDAY SERVICE'

As the *Sunday Service of the Methodists* purports to be an abridgement of the *Book of Common Prayer*, we should expect to find a close resemblance between the two books in the provision which they make for the public reading of the Scriptures. This is indeed the case. It should be noted first of all that the 1662 Prayer Book deals with this matter under four heads: (1) Lessons Proper for Sundays, consisting only of Old Testament readings for Mattins and Evensong; (2) Lessons Proper for Holy-Days, i.e. for every occasion (with three exceptions) for which a Collect, Epistle and Gospel are provided; (3) Proper Psalms on Certain Days, i.e. Christmas Day, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, Easter Day, Ascension Day, and Whit-Sunday; and (4) The Calendar, with the Table of Lessons from both Old and New Testaments for Morning and Evening Prayer on every day of the calendar year. This ensured the reading 'in course' of the entire Old Testament and Apocrypha once each year, and the New Testament (except the Book of the Revelation) three times in the year. The New Testament lessons for Sundays were those for the appropriate day of the month, extracted from the Calendar. Wesley followed the main outline of this fourfold pattern except that he altogether omitted (4). But there are interesting divergences in the *Sunday Service* from the *Book of Common Prayer*, which we will examine one by one.

First, Wesley's 'Proper Lessons to be read at Morning and Evening Prayer', which corresponds to (1) above. The 1662 Prayer Book naturally anticipated every contingency which could arise as a result of the changing date of Easter, and provided the necessary lessons for the maximum of six Sundays after Epiphany and for twenty-six Sundays after Trinity.⁴ Wesley ostensibly did the same, but in a different way. The twenty-six Sundays after Trinity are duly provided for, but there is no mention of the seasons of Epiphany and Lent. Instead, the four Sundays of Advent are followed by 'fifteen Sundays after Christmas', which in turn are followed by the Sunday before Easter and then Easter Day, i.e. seventeen Sundays after Christmas up to and including Easter Day. But the Prayer Book made provision for *eighteen* such Sundays, made up

as follows: two Sundays after Christmas; six Sundays after Epiphany; Septuagesima; Sexagesima, Quinquagesima; and six Sundays in Lent, followed by Easter Day. Here is confusion: where is Wesley's missing Sunday?

The determining factor in our search is the Sunday called Septuagesima, whose date is always determined by the date of Easter. Wesley followed the Prayer Book in prescribing for his ninth Sunday after Christmas the traditional readings for Septuagesima—Genesis 1 and 2. But Septuagesima coincides with the ninth Sunday after Christmas only in those liturgical years when Christmas Day falls between Wednesday and Sunday and when there are six Sundays after Epiphany—a very rare combination of circumstances. From Septuagesima to Easter, Wesley's lectionary shows four variations from the Prayer Book. For Quinquagesima Wesley gave Genesis 7 and 18 instead of Genesis 9 and 12; for the thirteenth Sunday after Christmas (i.e. the second Sunday in Lent) Wesley prescribed Genesis 24 and 37 as compared with Genesis 27 and 34. (This could have been an undetected printer's error; if so, it remained uncorrected in subsequent editions.) For the evening of the fourth Sunday of Lent Wesley gave Genesis 44 and 45 where the Prayer Book gave only Genesis 45. And here we come to the nub of the matter: the Prayer Book lessons for the fifth Sunday in Lent (Exodus 3 and 5) Wesley omitted altogether. This is the missing Sunday in Wesley's scheme. From this point onwards he reproduces the Prayer Book lessons without variation or omission.

Wesley cannot have given much thought to the matter, or he would not have committed this liturgical blunder. As a matter of fact, only seven times during the life of the *Sunday Service* would the number of Sundays for which Wesley made provision between Christmas and Easter be one short of the number required. But in all other years there would be a difficulty of another kind. Wesley's category of 'fifteen Sundays after Christmas' gave his preachers no clue to the vagaries of the Christian year, for a 'Table of Moveable Sabbaths' was not printed in the *Sunday Service* until 1817; and there could have been very few years when, in this period between Christmas and Easter (with the exception of the first Sunday after Christmas), the appropriate lessons were read.

It would be interesting to know why Wesley dispensed with the use of the terms 'Epiphany' and 'Lent', and preferred the all-embracing category of 'Sundays after Christmas'. His desire for simplicity (if such it was) led him into further difficulties when he came in his revision to the Collects, Epistles and Gospels, which he printed in full in the *Sunday Service*. He overlooked the fact that the Prayer Book made no provision in its 'proprs' for the Second Sunday after Christmas as such. (This omission was rectified in the 'Deposited' Prayer Book of 1928.) The Prayer Book rubric directed that on the Second Sunday after Christmas (when it occurred liturgically) the Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the Circumcision of Christ (1st January) were to be read. But Wesley took no cognizance of this feast, and omitted it altogether, with the result that his 'proprs' skip from the First Sunday after Christmas to the First Sunday after Epiphany, which he styled the Second Sunday after Christmas. So Wesley's 'proprs', like his lessons, are one Sunday short of the full required number, though the missing Sundays are not identical.

Two important consequences follow from this confusion. First, it happens that the first Sunday after Epiphany is the second Sunday after Christmas only

in those years when Christmas Day is a Sunday or a Monday. Only occasionally, therefore, would the appropriate Collect, Epistle and Gospel be read on the first Sunday after Epiphany. But even in those years (as well as in every other year) the scheme would be thrown out of joint by the variation in the number of Sundays after Epiphany, due to the changing date of Easter. Second, Wesley's failure to harmonize his scheme for Collects, Epistles and Gospels with his scheme of liturgical lessons had the curious result that only infrequently would the two schemes coincide. For example, in 1818 Septuagesima fell on 18th January, and it was the fourth Sunday after Christmas. A preacher who slavishly followed Wesley's *Sunday Service* would on that day read the Prayer Book Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the third Sunday after Epiphany, and the liturgical lessons for the second Sunday after Epiphany—which, as Euclid would have said, is absurd.

We do not know to what extent or with what rapidity the Methodists of the nineteenth century developed an appreciation of the finer points of liturgical procedure, but we suspect that any sympathetic tears we are inclined to shed for them as they wrestled with the intricacies of the *Sunday Service* are wasted. An examination of a great many circuit Plans of the period shows that the wiser amongst them sought and found guidance from the prefatory pages of the *Book of Common Prayer*; others made the best they could of Wesley's lectionary, with some curious results; whilst many superintendents omitted the appointed lessons from the Plan, leaving their preachers—like many of their modern successors, with less excuse—to go their own sweet way.

Before we leave this aspect of Wesley's 'Proper Lessons', it is necessary to state that although he supplied no Calendar from which the New Testament lessons could be extracted, he did append a rubric to his lectionary:

Let the Second Lesson in the Morning be a Chapter out of the Four Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles; and the Second Lesson in the Evening be a Chapter out of the Epistles, in regular Rotation; excepting where it is otherwise provided.

A strict adherence to this rubric would at least fulfil the spirit, if not the letter, of the Prayer Book Calendar in the matter of New Testament readings. It should be noted in passing, however, that Wesley's lectionary, like the Prayer Book, supplied New Testament lessons for the great festivals of Easter Day, Whitsunday, and Trinity Sunday, and for the Sunday next before Easter.

We now turn to Wesley's 'Proper Lessons for particular Days', corresponding to the Prayer Book (2) above. Wesley's Preface to the *Sunday Service* made it clear that he regarded the observance of 'holy-days' as 'answering no valuable end', and we are not therefore surprised that of the thirty-three such days for which the Prayer Book made provision, Wesley retained only three—the Nativity of Christ, Good Friday, and Ascension Day—and for them he prescribed lessons identical with those in the Prayer Book. It is strange, however, that Wesley omitted the lessons for All Saints Day, a festival he regularly observed, and which he more than once described as 'a day that I peculiarly love'.

Finally, Wesley's table of 'Proper Psalms on certain Days' differs from the corresponding table in the *Book of Common Prayer* in two particulars: Wesley omitted Ash Wednesday from his list, and in one or two instances reduced the number of the Psalms to be sung or said.

We have already stated that the *Sunday Service* continued to be published until the final edition of 1,000 copies in 1910, and Wesley's lectionary was printed unaltered until the end, despite the fact that the Conference of 1889 had authorized the publication and use of a new lectionary. It is unlikely that Wesley's lectionary was used during the later years; indeed, it is probable that its complications stultified it from the outset, and that for the greater part of the century its regular appearance in the *Sunday Service* was a formality.

'THE SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE OF THE METHODISTS'

The Library of the Epworth Press contains a copy of a book which, though modelled on the *Sunday Service*, bears no direct relation to it. It was an official publication of the Conference Office, with the title *The Sunday Morning Service of the Methodists*, and it bears the date 1812. Many of the familiar contents of the *Sunday Service* are missing from its pages; and, indeed, in many respects it is unique amongst pre-1882 Methodist service-books. The Lectionary in this curious book is one of its most interesting features. Wesley's table of 'Proper Lessons for Sundays' has disappeared, and its place is taken by a lectionary for each day of the year, but giving only the New Testament readings. These readings are, in fact, the second lessons for mornings as given in The Calendar in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*; and in this respect the lectionary amplifies the instruction in Wesley's *Sunday Service*: 'Let the Second Lesson in the Morning be a Chapter out of the Four Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles.' The Lectionary differs from the Prayer Book Calendar in only one detail: whereas the Calendar omits lessons for certain festival and saints' days, the deficiency being supplied by a separate table of 'Lessons for Holy Days', this lectionary makes no provision for these special days, and the dates are left blank. There is only one exception: the lectionary gives a lesson for the Feast of the Circumcision (1st January), which is passing strange when we remember Wesley's treatment of this day. We hazard the guess that those who used this book would find it almost as confusing in the matter of scripture lessons as the *Sunday Service* itself.

LATER WESLEYAN METHODIST LECTIONARIES

More than 100 years elapsed after the first publication of Wesley's *Sunday Service* before an attempt was made to give the Methodist people a lectionary that was at once both simple and comprehensive. The Wesleyan Conference of 1889 resolved that a 'Table of Lessons for Public Worship' should be prepared, and laid down certain rules for the guidance of those who prepared it. We reproduce those rules *in extenso*, not only because they illustrate the special requirements of a Methodist lectionary but also because they indicate some of the problems which every lectionary-maker must face:

1. That the Table of Lessons for Public Worship shall form part of a general scheme for the daily consecutive study of the Scriptures.
2. That this general scheme shall be so arranged as to include substantially the whole of Scripture in two years: the Old Testament, with the exception of the Book of Psalms, being read through once in two years, and the New Testament once every year.
3. The Psalms shall be arranged for use on every Sunday in the year, to be said or sung in Public Worship, or read in private, or both. In addition, a separate

arrangement of the Book of Psalms shall be made for use at the Week Evening Service or Prayer Meeting.

4. Proper Lessons shall be provided for the following Christian Festivals: Christmas Day, Good Friday, Easter Day, Ascension Day, Whit Sunday and Trinity Sunday, also for the First Sunday in Advent, each day in Passion Week (i.e. Holy Week?), New Year's Eve, New Year's Day, and the First Sunday in the New Year; and alternative lessons shall be provided for 'Children's Sunday' and 'Temperance Sunday'. Suitable Lessons shall also be suggested for the two Sundays of Conference, Harvest Thanksgivings, Chapel Openings, and Foundation-Stone Layings.

5. The general course of reading shall include two lessons for each service on Sundays, one from the Old Testament and one from the New Testament, together with suitable Psalms for use in Chapels where Psalms are not at present said or sung; and for each week-day two lessons, one from the Old Testament and one from the New.⁵

I have not seen a copy of the finished product, but the new lectionary was short-lived, for in 1904 the Conference directed the Connexional Editor, with the help of a small committee, to prepare another Lectionary.⁶ Six years later the Conference resolved that at the end of every triennial period the Lectionary should be revised so that 'the ordinary Lessons appointed for the morning service in the period thus ending shall be read in the evening and the evening series in the morning.'⁷

This lectionary also proved unsatisfactory, for in 1921 the Conference again appointed a committee 'to consider the principles upon which a Lectionary should be compiled for use at Divine Service, and to prepare a Lectionary in accordance therewith.' The principles agreed upon by the committee were: (1) the lectionary was to cover one year only; (2) the lessons were to be shorter than hitherto, and complete in themselves; (3) the evening lessons were to be separated from those of the morning; and (4) Psalms were to be given as alternative Old Testament lessons at stated intervals.⁸ On this basis the new lectionary was compiled, and it came into use in 1923.

LECTIONARIES SINCE METHODIST UNION

Methodist Union in 1932 brought an end to the existing Wesleyan Methodist lectionary, and for some years the united Church had no official guidance for the systematic reading of the Scriptures in public worship. The subject was not neglected, however, and the 1939 Conference adopted a new Lectionary which had been prepared by a large committee.⁹ The scheme covered two years, during which a large part of the Old Testament, in which every book was represented, was to be read, and the New Testament in its entirety. The morning and evening lessons were independent of each other, and each lesson was a self-contained unit. Admirable though this lectionary was in many respects, it got off to a bad start. Its major fault was that it was not a Master Lectionary; that is to say, it did not provide for every contingency in the liturgical year. As accepted by the Conference, the two years' scheme provided for four and one Sundays after Epiphany and twenty-five and twenty-seven Sundays after Trinity respectively; whereas in 1940 and 1941 (the first two years in which the new scheme operated) there were two and four Sundays after Epiphany, and twenty-seven and twenty-four Sundays after Trinity. From its inception, therefore, the Lectionary demanded an *ad hoc* adaptation, and

before long the annual lessons as printed in the *Minutes of Conference* bore little resemblance to the scheme accepted by the Conference. Another Lectionary was called for, and it began on Advent Sunday, 1954. It was a Master Lectionary, with rubrics which gave clear instructions for its use; but, despite its undoubted excellence, it had the defects which inevitably occur when such a task is undertaken by a committee, albeit (as in this case) a committee of only two persons. It has been short-lived, however, and it now gives place to yet another Lectionary which begins on Advent Sunday, 30th November 1958.

This latest lectionary, which may be expected to serve Methodism for many years, is the work of one compiler, who has profited by the mistakes of his predecessors, and has produced a series of lessons covering a two years' period which will undoubtedly commend itself to the Methodist people as it becomes familiar by use and experience. An explanatory leaflet will enable preachers to understand the principles which underly it, and by so doing will encourage them to use it regularly in their services.

CONCLUSION

The birth-pangs of the ideal lectionary, it will be seen, are both long and severe. The Church of England is now experimenting with its fifth lectionary since the Reformation, and Methodism with its seventh since 1784. But this fact need not dismay those who observe the Christian year and accept the principle of the systematic reading of the Scriptures in public worship. The compilation of a Methodist lectionary presents peculiar difficulties. Not only must it follow the Christian year, but within that framework it must make provision for many essentially Methodist occasions, such as Covenant Sunday, Young People's Day, Temperance Sunday, and Education Sunday, as well as the Harvest Thanksgiving, Remembrance Sunday, and other special days ignored by the Anglican lectionary. We may be grateful that a long period of trial and error has brought us at last within sight of perfection.

The use of a lectionary in Methodism, unlike the Church of England, remains optional. The prescribed lessons are printed on most circuit Plans, but the preacher is under no compulsion to use them. Many preachers, indeed, are prejudiced against them. But there is evidence of a growing acceptance of what may be called the 'lectionary principle' amongst our preachers, and it may be that the latest lectionary of 1958 will bring to Methodism a uniformity of practice which will undoubtedly be to the gain of the whole Church, preachers and people alike.

WESLEY F. SWIFT

¹ *The First and Second Prayer-Books of King Edward the Sixth* (Everyman edition), p.3. Cranmer's Preface was printed in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer under the heading 'Concerning the Service of the Church'.

² *ibid.*, p.4.

³ In the *Proceedings* of the Wesley Historical Society, XXIX.12-20, XXXI.112-18, 133-43.

⁴ The maximum possible number of Sundays after Trinity is twenty-seven, but the 1662 Table of Lessons made no provision for the twenty-seventh. Modern Anglican lectionaries supply a twenty-seventh Sunday, whose lessons are always to be read on the Sunday next before Advent. The 1662 Prayer Book gave 'propers' for only twenty-five Sundays, any extra Sundays being covered by a rubric. The 'Deposited' Prayer Book of 1928 styles the twenty-fifth Sunday 'the Sunday next before Advent', and adds the same rubric.

⁵ Wesleyan Methodist *Minutes of Conference*, 1889, pp.205-6.

⁶ *ibid.*, 1904, p.361.

⁷ *ibid.*, 1910, p.368.

⁸ *ibid.*, 1922, p.273.

⁹ The scheme was explained and the Lectionary printed in full in the *Conference Agenda*, 1939, pp.266-73.

Recent Literature

EDITED BY R. NEWTON FLEW

The Nature and Authority of the Bible, by Raymond Abba. (James Clarke, 21s.)

The reader for whom this book is primarily intended, and for whom it will prove most useful, is the layman prepared to give serious thought to the understanding of the Bible. Chapter VI expresses the conviction that the Old Testament cannot be understood apart from the events described and interpreted in the New, and that the real significance of the New Testament cannot be grasped without the background and preparation which the Old provides. Thus the Old Testament is claimed to show both the historical preparation for the coming of Christ and also prophetic insight into that purpose of God which is completely embodied in Christ. This is illustrated by reference to the themes of the Covenant, Covenant People, Servant of the Lord, Rule of God, the Messianic Hope, and Sacrifice. In the earlier portion of the book problems of historicity are discussed, archaeological evidence is presented, source critics and form critics are introduced. Nowhere, however, are we given a mere patchwork for all is woven into the pattern dictated by the thesis of Chapter VI. The closing chapters of the book on 'Differing Levels of Truth,' and 'The Word of God' deal with the problem of authority and agree with Brunner that the content and the real authority of Scripture is Christ. In a most useful section there is an examination of the teaching of Jesus and its application in our own time to the practical issues of military service and divorce. An appendix gives a summary of evidence concerning, and views about, the Dead Sea Scrolls. The author reverses the tendency of the late Bishop Barnes, who sought to placate the scientists at the expense of the historians, and treats the New Testament miracles in conservative fashion. He rightly points out that Bultmann's objection to the miracle stories of the Gospels is not really because of their incompatibility with Philippians 2, but he nowhere reconciles his own views with the Kenosis doctrine. Occasionally the author overstates his case as when he says that the Old Testament all centres in God—forgetting Esther and Song of Songs? Sometimes, as in the dating of the Fourth Gospel, and whether the last supper was a Passover meal, the author takes a position shared by many scholars without however always doing justice to other positions. There are minor blemishes of typesetting: p.54, 'anagogical' for 'analogical', p.90, 'fulfillment' for 'fulfilment', p.113, 'The' for 'They', and p.262, a misplaced apostrophe. None of this should however obscure the real merit of a book which brings together a large amount of material not readily accessible to the ordinary reader, while footnotes and additional notes on linguistic and critical minutiae enhance its value for students.

VINCENT PARKIN

The Study of Old Testament Theology Today, by Edward J. Young. (James Clarke, 10s. 6d.)

This book, which bears the imprimatur of the London Bible College, consists of four lectures given at the College last May with the titles, Old Testament Theology and History, and the Nature, Content, and Influence of Old Testament Theology. In his Preface, Dr Young says that they 'adopt the standpoint that the Scriptures are authoritative and trustworthy', and the book develops the theme that only with such pre-suppositions derived from the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit can any true theology of the Old Testament be written. The Old Testament revelation is progressive—'we cannot expect to find a fully-developed presentation of Christian truth in the Old Testament'—with its emphasis on the fall of man, God's redemption, and

the Messiah, though Dr Young finds the Chalcedonian Definition fully supported by the Old Testament. There are others who are unable to accept Dr Young's attitude to the Bible, and who yet believe that it is the record of God's revelation. These also, as well as the adherents of the conservative theology adore God as the One who has graciously given to sinful man the Word of redemption.

CYRIL S. RODD

Gambling in English Life, by E. Benson Perkins. (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.)

All the essentials are here—stated clearly, marshalled concisely, a microscope would not reveal an overstatement. In short, the cumulative power of the best advocacy—as would be expected—since it is Benson Perkins on gambling. No politician who aspires to honest statesmanship can continue long to ignore this social cancer. It needed drastic surgery in 1823. Yet in 1958 men are still telling us that it is 'not a malignant growth', and leader-writers re-phrase their old blundering descriptions of a favourite cock-shy misnamed 'Puritanism', and moral theologians are waffling about intangible abstractions ('sin in itself' and 'surplus money'). And the preachers (for the most part) observe a judicious silence, and their hearers (as well as their non-hearers) are mortally afraid of the modern bogey of 'narrow-mindedness'. ('Ignorance—pure ignorance, madam', as Dr Johnson said.) No man who desires to preach the gospel—or to live it—can avoid this plain duty of Christian citizenship: to know the will of God for himself and his fellows while millions of covetous, and deluded, 'investors' contribute more than £600,000,000 per annum to the equally covetous, and more successful, exploiters. A suggestion—and a plea! Pp. 20-2 tell of the introduction of the 'tote' and the 'dogs'. There is a story behind these events. The incredible acceptance of the Chancellor's Tote Bill (by a majority of two, if memory serves aright) and the defeat of John Buchan's Dog-racing Bill by sheer gerry-mandering in Committee—though it had passed the House by a record majority (400 and something considerable) is partly told in *Hansard*. But the unscrupulous pressure of Whips and Treasury is the *real* story—and it should be told in the next edition. May it be soon! Not long ago a highly-placed bank-manager was heard to say, at the close of a statement of the Christian case on money and gambling, 'Unanswerable—completely unanswerable!' (He refused to let his staff advertise or advocate the sale of Premium Bonds—though, of course, they had to sell them over the counter on demand.) It was a true verdict—and it will be echoed by thousands if this book can be adequately circulated. Buy it; digest it; proclaim it! *Some seed will bear fruit!*

R. DOUGLAS MOORE

Church Dogmatics, Vol. II, Part 2, by Karl Barth. (T. & T. Clark, 50s.)

On p.648 of this volume Barth writes: 'From the standpoint of the truth itself thorough-going conservatives are as useless as thorough-going modernists.' This conclusion is amply illustrated in these pages, though Barth shows that he is not afraid of either of these alternatives. In actual fact, in the first half of the book, the section dealing with election, he is strikingly modern. He is extremely critical of the views of Augustine, Aquinas, and the Reformers on the ground that their conception of election was static. They held that there was a double divine predestination from the beginning. They maintained that the 'book of life' had a death column and that the names were written in both from the foundation of the world. Barth rejects this view outright on the grounds that it abandons the freedom of God in history, it makes God less than gracious, it separates election entirely from Jesus Christ, and it makes the human story very like the running off of a film. Barth on the other hand upholds a dynamic theology in which things are actually happening and decisions, those of God and those of man, do alter things. Election must be kept very close to Jesus Christ. This means that all are elect to salvation in Christ and only those who refuse election will be rejected, and their rejection is based on the fact that in rejecting God they have rejected themselves.

There is no specific predestination of any individual to damnation. 'As the Bible presents the matter there is no election which cannot be followed by rejection, no rejection which cannot be followed by election' (p.186). Rejection is entirely dissimilar to election; it is the reverse side of election, not existing in its own right but as the outcome of the refusal of God's electing grace. Election is always primary. Much attention is devoted to Romans 9-11. Barth upholds the notion that a nation or a group may be elected to God, but the end in all such instances is the salvation of individuals. There is no more guarantee that Israel (as a whole) will ultimately be saved than that any particular elect man will be. The danger of falling finally away opens up before us all, but it is not the will of God that any should perish. In the second part of the book Barth deals with the Command of God, or the basis of Christian Ethics. He maintains that the Lordship of Christ involves our obedience to God's commandments, and that Christian Ethics should therefore be worked out in close dependence on Dogmatics. There is no valid general ethic which men could discover by investigating their own nature, for human nature is fallen and every law which they derive from their own nature expresses their own wishes, not God's Will. The only ethic which has validity for the Christian is based on the commandments of God and must be received as God's command, not as something which is recognized by human insight to be good. The command is inseparable from the gospel and must necessarily follow it. In this section Barth shows himself to be extremely conservative and narrow. His line of thought sounds impressive until the question is raised concerning God's will in particular instances. Then, in most cases, it turns out to be as useless as the Kantian maxim concerning action and universal law. In some instances we are aware of the content of God's command but in many we are not, yet we cannot delay action until a clear divine command is received. We must act and our action will probably be greatly influenced by the thinking of the moral philosophers, and will have the nature of an expression of our own insight rather than obedience to a divine command. This volume illustrates the great strength and weakness of the whole Barthian Theology. As the systematic working out of the content of the biblical revelation it is exceedingly impressive but the principle, reiterated here, that Theology goes astray once it allows questions to be put to it from outside its own framework, is a counsel of despair. Men have a right to ask questions about their own nature and destiny, their own questions, and the Christian theologian has the duty to listen to them and to do his best to answer them. In this respect the catholic validation of natural law appears more commendable than Barth's renunciation of it.

PERCY SCOTT

Teach Them to Live, by Frances Banks. (Parrish, 30s.)

Prison walls not only shut people in; they also shut people out, and most of the community has little idea what happens to a man after he has been sentenced to a prison term. On the one hand, books by ex-prisoners expose the boredom and futility of prison life; on the other hand, the demand is often heard for less namby-pambyism and sterner punishment, but only those directly concerned know the disappointments and the hopes, the heart-aches and the joy of trying to rebuild shattered lives. Miss Banks throws a revealing light on this neglected side of prison life, for prison to her is not primarily a place of punishment, but a school or hospital where men are made whole. She does not deal directly with religion, but a deep religious conviction lies behind the whole book, that men are worth saving and that men can be saved. While it is of primary interest to those connected with prison work, it is also a valuable social document and has relevance for all concerned with human nature and the welfare of society. The book is based upon her experience as Tutor Organizer at Maidstone Prison, which led her to make a study of educational work in prisons throughout the country. She reminds us how recent is the history of education in prisons, beginning

as part of the chaplain's work, developing in the 1920s under voluntary teachers with the main purpose of reducing the monotony of the evening hours, and only since 1945 becoming a regular and permanent part of the prison system with the appointment of tutor organizers of education. The various forms of educational and cultural activities now carried on, classes, drama, art, music, hobbies, etc., are described and examined, together with the kind of response which these efforts produce. She believes these have a therapeutic value and that their wider use would help to create a change in the attitude and outlook of the prisoner. There are many valuable suggestions for making the educational approach more effective. She sees education, not as a side-line or a diversional evening occupation, but as part of the main stream of prison life under a properly organized Education Department. She believes that by better classification of prisoners, by intensive short courses, by group therapy, by giving opportunities for creative expression, educational work can be improved and those in prison taught to live. The attitude is one of sympathy, understanding and faith, for Miss Banks firmly believes that 'the history of prison education is an unbroken record of trust answering trust, of human response to human approach', and she sees the prisoner as 'primarily an adult in need of education and only secondarily a prisoner in need of reform'. Yet the book is practical, facing the extraordinary difficulties of such an approach when dealing with men who are often weak and emotionally inadequate, ranging from illiterates to the hard core of incorrigibles, and working in an environment which has many limitations. Education sometimes fails even under the most favourable circumstances. It is much more difficult under the conditions of prison life! But she has faith and hope that this method can and does succeed. In such a programme everything depends on the kind of people who carry it out. Miss Banks has proved in her own work at Maidstone that, given the faith she has, it will work and that prisoners can be taught to live.

LEONARD CONSTANTINE

Person and Reality: an Introduction to Metaphysics, by Edgar S. Brightman. (New York: The Ronald Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$6.50.)

By the death of Professor Brightman, American scholarship and American Methodism have lost an outstanding philosopher. For over thirty years, from 1919 to 1953, he held the Chair of Philosophy at Boston University, where he maintained the 'personalist' school of philosophy which had been established by his distinguished predecessor Borden P. Bowne. His output was enormous, and even the 'select' bibliography which is included in this volume lists seventeen books and over 100 articles. Professor Brightman had almost finished this book at the time of his death, and it has been carefully edited and prepared for publication by his successor, Professor Bertocci, Professor Jannette Newhall, assistant professor in the same department, and by Professor Brightman's son. They have done their work well and have filled in the gaps in Brightman's chapters by incorporating portions from his other writings. The book therefore is a complete treatment and is very much as the author himself could have published it. Personalism is by no means a new school of philosophy, but in our century it was given elaborate exposition by Professor Borden P. Bowne, after whom the Chair of Philosophy in Boston University is named. In the words of Professor Albert Knudson, who was another exponent of this school of thought and was a contemporary of Brightman at Boston, personalism is a theory 'which finds in the conscious unity, identity and free activity of personality the key to the nature of reality and the solution of the ultimate problems of philosophy'. Pushed to its extreme, this can easily end in pure subjectivism and the disappearance of standards altogether. It was not surprising therefore that Bowne found himself the victim of a heresy trial in the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1903, although he was acquitted. On the other hand, the emphasis on personality and selfhood accords not

only with theism but with theism as interpreted by Christianity. To make this connexion was particularly the work of Knudson, and the reviewer once met in the Belgian Congo an American Methodist missionary to whom Knudson's *Philosophy of Personalism* was almost next in value to the Bible. There is little reference to Knudson in this volume before us, but this may be accounted for on reference to the sub-title, 'an Introduction to Metaphysics'. Brightman is concerned with philosophy, not theology. The word 'Introduction' is somewhat of a misnomer if it be taken to be a beginner's guide to the subject. It is very far from that, for it is concerned with what appear to Brightman to be certain basic principles and he sets them out after the manner of Kant's 'Prolegomena to any future metaphysic'. He has his own peculiar vocabulary, which adds to the difficulty of reading him. 'Belief in the absent', he says, 'is normally accepted as true or probably true in so far as it illuminates the present. The absent illuminates, the present reflects.' Accordingly for the rest of the book Brightman uses the terms the 'shining present' and the 'illuminating absent', although it is difficult to see what is gained by the use of these adjectives. The book is in three parts—experience and reason, categories of being, realms of being, and it is in the last that he comes to a discussion of the nature of God, in what he calls 'an empirical approach'. It is a provocative book, not always easy to follow, but well repaying the trouble. It raises all the main questions in metaphysics and if it is a little too cocksure in presenting solutions it is none the worse for that.

A. VICTOR MURRAY

Calvin: Commentaries. Newly translated and edited by Joseph Haroutunian and L. P. Smith. (S.C.M. Press, 35s.)

The editors of this volume have tried, as they say in their Introduction, to produce a readable version of a representative part of Calvin's work as a biblical commentator. It can be said at once that they have admirably succeeded. Something of the immensity of their task will be realized if it is remembered that Calvin's commentaries on the books of the Old and New Testaments fill forty-five volumes in the old Calvin Translation Society edition. In dealing with this formidable mass of material, they were guided, they tell us, by no single principle of selection, but rather took what they liked; yet they have clearly not been indifferent either to Calvin's own major concerns or to living issues in present-day theology. Moreover, in their search for 'what they liked' they have quite evidently ransacked the whole field. Other editors would, no doubt, have produced a quite different selection, which might have been just as valuable, and most readers will be able to think of improvements from their own point of view. But among the various topics under which the material here selected is arranged—the Bible, the Knowledge of God, Jesus Christ, the Christian Life, Faith, Providence, Election and Predestination, Ethics and the Common Life, the Church—the one notable omission seems to be a section on the Holy Spirit. Some place might also have been given to Assurance, which does not even receive mention, as the Holy Spirit does, in the Index. There is, however, a useful historical and theological Introduction, followed by some Introductory Selections from Calvin himself, including his Preface to the New Testament and an autobiographical sketch. From the latter we learn, among other things, that Calvin was 'by nature a man of the country and a lover of shade and leisure', and, more surprisingly, that he was 'by nature timid, mild, and cowardly'. The rest of the book bears eloquent testimony to the fearless and tireless devotion with which he sought to expound the Word of God, and to his outstanding ability as a scholar and teacher. Those who know him only from the *Institutes* will find much in this volume to enlarge and illumine their understanding of the man and his work, and those who do not know him at all might be well advised to begin here rather than with the *Institutes*.

PHILIP S. WATSON

Ten Years. Edited by Alan A. Jacka. (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

This most enlightening book has an important place in the library of all who are concerned with the welfare of children. It tells of the great strides made in caring for all conditions of childhood, shedding considerable light on the lesser-known sides of the work since the Children's Act of 1948. Valuable information is given about the significance of the voluntary social services and the way in which they are complementary to those of the State, particularly the way in which personal voluntary leadership has its own ethos. An interesting feature is the comparison between boarding schools and residential homes for children and the way in which these homes may compensate for the normal home and holiday life. The religious life of the child is mentioned and attention drawn to ways in which it may be cultured though one feels more notice might have been given to the repercussions of the 1944 Education Act, for many children now needing care have passed through ordinary day schools for some period of their lives. There is a study of youth's emotional upheavals and ways in which growing up may lead towards adjusted and responsible citizenship, an informative chapter on Child Care stories, while a final chapter gives data as to ways in which young people may take their place in normal adult life and activities. *Ten Years* is altogether a satisfying survey, yet leaving one sure that further progress must be made and that there are those who while guarding the lines of communication between past and present are yet ready to adventure into new fields of exploration.

DORIS W. STREET

Christian Pacifism in History, by G. H. Nuttall. (Blackwell, 10s. 6d.)

In every age the Church has had its pacifists, and indeed in its earliest days it seems to have been an entirely pacifist society. Sometimes these pacifists have been isolated individuals and sometimes members of some consciously pacifist Christian group. Dr Nuttall does not concern himself with the former, but concentrates on those bodies of Christians whose belief and practice included pacifism. He makes no attempt to cover the whole ground, but drops a plumb line as it were into five periods of Church history and takes a sounding in each. He finds that each period has its own particular emphasis, and while recognizing that in every period the arguments for pacifism are many, he concentrates in each case on what he feels to be the main one. Thus in the Early Church he believes that Christians refused to serve in the imperial forces mainly because the career of a soldier involved emperor worship and idolatry; in the Middle Ages he finds that the forerunners of the Reformation—the Waldenses, the Lollards and the Moravian Brethren—stressed obedience to the law of Christ which taught them to love their enemies; in the period of the Reformation he sees the forerunners of the Baptist Churches—the Anabaptists and Mennonites—stressing the necessity of being willing to suffer for Christ, recognizing that this would often involve the suffering of their friends and families, and remembering the words: 'If any man love father or mother more than me, he is not worthy of me'; in the seventeenth century he finds the Quakers stressing the Inner Light which enlightens every man, and therefore believing that every man is worth redeeming and capable of being redeemed, a faith which led both to their social work and to their belief that they could appeal to 'that of God' in their enemies by enduring suffering at their hands, but not by killing them; in the present century, when there has been a tremendous growth of pacifism among Christians of all denominations, he finds the main emphasis laid on redemption, on the fact that the way of the cross was the way taken by Christ for the redemption of man, and that those who are on the side of Christ for the world's healing must seek to win men by His method. This picking out of one particular characteristic in each age results, as the author recognizes, in a good deal of over-simplification. In concentrating, for

example, on the objection which the Early Church had to idolatry, he very much underrated their objection to causing bloodshed and suffering. But the method makes for clarity, and is justified by the fact that it enables much more ground to be covered. It is good to be reminded that the Christian pacifism of our own day is part of a debate which has constantly exercised the minds of Christians in all ages and in every part of the world, and no one can read the story of these pacifist groups without being both moved and illuminated.

J. A. KAY

Religions, by D. W. Gundry. (Macmillan, 16s.)

Mr Gundry covers much the same ground as Dr Bouquet in his book, *Comparative Religion*, in the Pelican series. But he does so more briefly, and has produced a most useful elementary introduction, one that can be used, for instance, in the sixth forms of schools. Hence the account which he gives of the various religions of the world, ancient and modern, is extremely succinct, and care has been taken to explain technical terms. In the opening chapters on the origin and development of religion he preserves a healthy and welcome agnosticism. He doubts whether we can ever have sufficient data to speak with certainty about the beginnings of religious beliefs among men or whether any single simple explanation will suffice; and he rejects any neat evolutionist theories of the growth of religion, such as that of Frazer, with its successive stages of magic, religion, science, or that other familiar pattern—animism, polytheism, monotheism, and he brings evidence to show that all these can co-exist 'at different levels of enlightenment at any one period'. But he finds traces of an incipient monotheism, or a tendency to monotheism, arising in many religions, even the most primitive, and this is the theme which helps to bind the various chapters together. Though he writes frankly as a Christian, his treatment of other religions is sympathetic, and he suggests that Christians may have something to learn from them. But his conclusions in the final chapter leave, as perhaps is inevitable, certain important questions unanswered. The religious experience, he says, finds its noblest expression in the two main types, Monism and Monotheism, 'Buddhism being the crown of the former, Christianity of the latter'—a statement which very little argument is brought to justify. Monism is then rejected on the grounds of its abstractness and escapism; and that leaves only Christianity in the field. This would seem to us to be a value-judgement; but later the validity of value-judgements in the sphere of religion is questioned. While reason has its place, that place comes after the initial act of faith. We cannot make a purely objective judgement, we can only truly know a religion existentially, by committing ourselves to it. But we cannot do this for all religions, therefore our best plan is to commit ourselves more fully to Christianity, the religion of the society to which we belong. So brief a summary does not perhaps do full justice to Mr Gundry's argument, and one must agree that much of what he says is wise and relevant. But basically is his argument any different from that of Gandhi that because Hinduism is the religion of India it is the best for Indians? And while this may serve for a non-proselytizing faith like Hinduism, what justification is there here for Christian missions, or the appeal for conversion from one faith to another? However this book is not missionary apologetic; it is written specifically for Western Christians who are starting out on the study of comparative theology; and for such it would be difficult to find a simpler or clearer account of the religions of the world, or a more stimulating introduction.

G. ERNEST LONG

The Independents in the English Civil War, by George Yule. (C.U.P.), 21s.

The author of this essay, who is Lecturer in History in the University of Melbourne,

points out how difficult it is in most instances to give definite answers to many apparently simple questions about the English Civil War. The chief purpose of his researches is to try and discover the connexion between the Parliamentary Independent party and religious Independency. In 1938 an article by Professor Hexter in the *American Historical Review* claimed that the majority of Independent Members of Parliament were in fact Presbyterian elders, and as a result subsequent writers were inclined to ignore the religious factor in favour of purely sociological interpretations. Mr Yule's investigation of the Independent political group leaves him unsatisfied with this type of explanation and he is led to the conclusion that religion was a basic factor, which bound together the heterogeneous Independent party, and yet in only a limited sense. He recognizes how difficult it is to find any formula which really explains the Independent party in Parliament. Professor Trevor-Roper identified the Independents as a social group consisting of the 'lesser gentry' and considers that they were the party of decentralization of government, religion, trade, law and education. Mr Yule is not entirely satisfied with this latter hypothesis. The Independents were obviously a composite party, combining men of both radical and conservative outlooks, although in comparison with the Presbyterians they were all religious radicals. In effect the uniting factor appears to have been a demand for a type of religious toleration, although not always to the same degree. The essay has interesting things to say about the complicated religious situation during the Commonwealth and Protectorate. The author will not allow that the Independents originated from the Elizabethan separatists, the Brownists, in spite of many similarities. He thinks that the first Independent congregation was that of Henry Jacob (1616), who tried to combine the best in both conforming and separatist Puritanism by setting up a congregation 'which, while Separatist in organization, nevertheless desired to remain in communion with the Church of England'. There were of course radical Independents, yet the position of the classical Independents was independency in church government without separation of Church and State. It was a form of Christianity which sought to combine religious enthusiasm with the preservation of the social framework. The main section of the book is comparatively short, and this is perhaps the drawback. The reader would often benefit from a fuller statement of the points. Yet, taken with such a work as Dr Nuttall's recent *Visible Saints*, he will learn a great deal about a period in our history in which religion and politics were bound together to a remarkable degree.

NORMAN P. GOLDHAWK

Wesley's Prayers and Praises, edited by J. Alan Kay. (Epworth Press, 15s.)

Dr George Osborn's collected edition of *The Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley*, published in thirteen volumes in 1868-72, has long been out of print, and even secondhand copies are almost unobtainable. Present-day publishing costs preclude a reprint, but the Connexional Editor has in part met this need by his new book, which makes available over 300 little-known Wesley hymns and poems. Wesley's enormous poetical output inevitably made the task of selection one of considerable magnitude. Few, however, will quarrel with the result, for Dr Kay's novel arrangement has given his selection cohesion and unity. There are four main sections: Praise and Adoration, The Christian Experience, The Life of the Church, and The Daily Round. The last three are considerably subdivided, with the commendable result that almost every aspect of Christian life and service is represented. One example will suffice: under the sub-heading 'Prayers for use by servants of the Church' there are hymns for a chorister, a physician, teachers and leaders, preachers, a candidate for the ministry, ordinands, ministers, and an aged minister. Youth workers and women's meetings were unknown in Wesley's day, or they also might well have found a place! This arrangement has inevitably disrupted Osborn's scheme, in which the poems were printed chronologically

as they had appeared in Wesley's original editions. Dr Kay has partly compensated for this by the addition of a comprehensive Index, in which every hymn is related to the corresponding volume in Osborn's edition. We wish, however, that Dr Kay had added in each case the name of Wesley's publication (or, at the very least, the date), and indicated, where appropriate, the Scripture passages on which the poems were based. This would have been an added boon to the student. But this book is intended for use 'mainly in private devotion'. The reader who thus uses it will find Dr Kay's admirable Introduction of considerable value. He has eschewed the lines of exposition made familiar by Bett and Manning, and, taking his own scheme as his guide, examines the various aspects of Charles Wesley's Christian experience, and discusses the spiritual qualities which made Wesley's versification of his experience such an effective instrument for the work of the Methodist revival. Dr Kay's little essay deserves as careful study as the hymns themselves. We have nothing but unreserved praise and gratitude for this book. Those who possess Dr Osborn's thirteen volumes will be constrained to turn to them again; those not so fortunate will discover that much of Wesley's poetical work, though quite unsuited for use in modern worship, retains a devotional quality which is independent of time and circumstance. 'We in the twentieth century', writes Dr Kay, 'with our concern about mental health, nuclear physics, international relationships, Church unity and racialism, need the message which he proclaims, and we need it expressed in the natural, direct way in which he expresses it.' The hymns of the Wesleys have too long been under a cloud; the very fact that this book has been compiled and published is a sure sign that in this respect a brighter day is dawning.

WESLEY F. SWIFT

On Reading the English Bible, by T. E. Jessop; *A Colony of Heaven*, by Rupert E. Davies; *Draw Near with Faith*, by Allen Birtwhistle. (Epworth Press, 5s., 5s., and 6s.)

One of the more hopeful signs of our times is the return to Bible study by countless individuals and groups in the Churches. To bring this about, many influences have been at work, and among them are those to whom these three books owe something of their origin—Biblical scholarship, the B.B.C., and Church study conferences. *On Reading the English Bible* is the third A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture, and it is a worthy tribute to a teacher who did so much to unfold the treasures of Scripture. Professor Jessop addresses himself to the 'ordinary Christian, for whom the reading of the Bible is a plain duty, but who may find it foreign, difficult, boring, or otherwise unrewarding' and writes so fascinatingly about it that 'one of the usual copies of the English Bible' seen through his eyes becomes familiar, plain, exciting, and rewarding indeed. Above all, it becomes the Word of the living God. If Professor Jessop's concern is with the Bible in its wholeness, Mr Rupert Davies' is with one part of it, the Epistle to the Philippians. *A Colony of Heaven* consists of five addresses broadcast from West Country schools and churches, and it has the clarity and directness of a good radio script. Mr Davies presents the Apostle, not as a long dead figure from the dim and distant past, but as one whose message is as relevant to our world as it was to his own. With its convenient divisions and excellent questions for discussion the book will make good material for study groups and church fellowships and will amply repay their attention. *Draw Near with Faith* is another stirring and enriching book whose substance was first delivered to a young people's missionary conference, an annual conference of the University Methodist Societies and a family conference arranged by the Women's Fellowship of the Methodist Church. Taking Charles Wesley's hymn, 'Thou great mysterious God unknown', and part of the Service of Holy Communion as his starting-point, Mr Birtwhistle writes of doing and hearing the word; companionship, divine and human; and the indwelling of the Spirit. Light is shed on many Bible passages and on some of the great but difficult words of the Christian Faith, the illustrative material is apt and

abundant and the whole is a book which many preachers will find stimulating and will be glad to put into the hands of thoughtful members of their congregations. Again, there are questions for discussion and they will lead many a reader first to private meditation and to self-examination. Of these three small books we may well say, 'Here's richness'.

ARNOLD MORRIS

From My New Shelf

BY R. NEWTON FLEW

Lourdes: Les Protestants et la Tradition Chrétienne, by Pierre Petit (Collection 'Les Bergers et les Mages', 47 rue de Clichy, Paris, 9e). Amid the library of books which have been written in the last 100 years about Lourdes, this book deserves special notice. It is timely, and sincere. There are no fewer than 268 notes, and they occupy thirty-four pages out of a total of 134 in the book. The author is a Protestant, and feels himself called to write this book in the service of the ecumenical movement. His role is not that of a chronicler or historian, or a doctor or a philosopher. He does call attention to the apparent absence of expert theological guidance. But his aim is to look at the stories of apparitions, miracles, message, and pilgrimage. These four constitute the headings of this book. We can recognize at once the reverence, the charity, the evangelistic fervour, with which he approaches his theme. The chief questions are whether these apparitions are genuine and do they carry any clear message of the Virgin. (a) The official recognition of apparitions by their inclusion in the liturgy is a new fact (p.13). The four apparitions in the nineteenth century took place on French soil: the first at Paris (Rue de Bac, 1830), the second at La Salette (1846), the third at Lourdes (1858), and the fourth at Pontmain (1871). The rest are said to have occurred in Portugal (Fatima, 1917) and in Belgium (Beauzaing, 1932 and 1933, and Banneaux (1933)). The problem for Protestants has been stated by Pastor Pierre Maury: 'The doctrine of Mary and the devotion to the Virgin seem to mark out with increasing precision the true problems of our relations with the Church of Rome.' I would add that they will be the more perplexing because of the official ignoring of the lessons of the spirituality of the past. St John of the Cross, whom von Hügel reverently quotes as 'the classical authority on such things', says: 'All visions, revelations, and heavenly feelings, and whatever is greater than these, are not worth the least act of humility, bearing the fruits of that charity which neither values nor seeks itself, which thinketh well not of self but of all others.' 'To any suppliant asking for visions, God could answer Fix thy gaze only on My Son. . . . He is all my Word,

all my answer, all my revelation. . . . I have given Him unto thee to be thy brother, thy master, thy companion, thy ransom, thy reward' (*Ascent of Mt Carmel*, II, 20).

(b) In cures claimed to be miraculous the Church is guided by the following rules laid down by Pope Benedict XIV (1740-58) in the four volumes, *On the Beatification and Canonization of the Servants of God*. The seven rules are: the disease should be (1) very grave and impossible, or at least very difficult, to cure; (2) not on the decline or of such a nature that it might in any case improve; (3) without previous medical treatment having been given, or, if it has been given, it must have been useless; (4) the cure must have been sudden, instantaneous; (5) the cure must have been complete; (6) it should not correspond to a crisis brought about by natural causes; (7) and after the cure there must be no recurrence of the illness. The official practice should be based on these rules, but there were many serious shortcomings in the evidence up to the year 1946. This was admitted by a team of French Catholic specialists, sponsored by the Catholic Medical Society of St Luke. Since 1946 only eleven cures have passed the official tests laid down by the Medical Bureau at Lourdes, the International Medical Bureau in Paris, and an ecclesiastical and medical canonical commission appointed by the Archbishop to whose province the patient belongs. These have been examined in a special monograph by Dr D. J. West, *Eleven Lourdes Miracles* (Duckworth, 1957). His general conclusion is that there is no absolutely convincing evidence for miraculous intervening in any of the Lourdes cases. (c) Incredulity will be increased by comparing the passages of Scripture which speak of the Virgin with the messages which the apparitions gave to Bernadette: 'Pray God for sinners! Penitence!'—a cry repeated three times. 'Go and tell the priests to build here a chapel.' A request that a procession shall be formed. At 5 a.m. on Thursday, March 25th, 1858, Bernadette asked the Lady who she was. She replied: 'I am the Immaculate Conception.' This answer was made three times.

The Faith of a Methodist, by Eric Baker (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.). The Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1958 is just what the Trustees hoped for when they urged the Secretary of the Methodist Conference to attempt an apparently impossible task. He has re-stated our faith in language which the 'average' Methodist or even the man in the street can understand. Dr Sangster says that an awful responsibility rests upon every preacher to bind together doctrine and duty, so that the doctrines must be preached practically, and the duties doctrinally'. Here in Dr Baker's book is an illustration of preaching doctrine practically. In Part II there are chapters on 'God', 'Man', 'Sin', 'Forgiveness', 'Immortality', 'The Church', and 'The Holy Spirit'. Every last paragraph in every one of these chapters is an offer of the grace of God. Every last paragraph points the reader onward to the perfect love revealed in Jesus Christ. Dr Baker's touch is sure, because he has gone back to our own peculiar emphasis in Christian doctrine. That emphasis is on the goal of the Christian life. This is 'perfection', and there is a model treatment of our doctrine on pp.21-46 of this book.

Ministry and Priesthood: Christ's and Ours, by T. W. Manson (Epworth Press, 6s. 6d.). Here are two lectures, the one in memory of A. S. Peake, who died twenty-nine years ago, and the second in memory of John Scott Lidgett who died in 1953. Now, almost before the publication of this book, comes the news of the death of the author. We should be thankful that he has left us this parting legacy. 'The Ministry of Jesus and the Task of His Church' was the subject of the first Scott Lidgett lecture. The Ministry of Jesus is not to be separated from the task of His Church. They are one. If we want to have right conceptions of the task awaiting the Church, there is only one way by which we can get them. That is by studying Jesus of Nazareth as He is portrayed for us in the Gospels. Some of us had arrived independently at the conclusion that Jesus Himself is the New Law of God. Just as Origen said that Jesus

Himself was the Kingdom of God, so we may not be going too far to say that Jesus Himself is not only the Teacher, but the Teaching. Compare this with the Letter to the Ephesians, 4²⁰: 'It is not in this way that you have *learned Christ*.' The *Method* was to study Him at work; and at His call, to share it. He was waging a Holy War against all those unseen forces that degrade and destroy human beings from within. His work was to 'tread all the powers of darkness down, and win the well-fought day.' Christ Himself is the Teaching, Christ the Companion, Christ the Victor. The second lecture is 'The Priesthood of Believers'. This is a closely-reasoned treatment of one of the most misunderstood phrases in our Reformation tradition. Dr Manson has worked through the jungle, and the way is open now. 'When the terms of priesthood are applied to Christ and Christians, it is of sacrifices offered to God that we are to think' (pp.54-5). The words for 'sacrifice' have been scrutinized afresh. We cannot too often remind ourselves that sacrifice in the Bible is a *religious* act, and we shall never come to the depth of it 'by bringing in ideas derived from the theory and practice of Western criminal law' (p.59). 'Each believer offers himself as a sacrifice according to the pattern laid down by Christ, and all these individual offerings are taken up into the one perpetual offering made by the one eternal High-Priest of the New Covenant.' Justin Martyr, the *Didache*, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen (in his Exhortation to Martyrdom)—all follow this interpretation of the priesthood of all believers (pp.64-6). It is indeed a rich parting gift which Professor T. W. Manson has bequeathed to those of us who teach, and particularly to those who preach.

The Mystery of the Lord's Supper, Sermons on the Sacrament preached in the Kirk of Edinburgh in AD 1589, by Robert Bruce, translated and edited by Thomas F. Torrance (James Clarke, 15s.). This series of sermons was published first in 1590 and 1591. They had been taken down as they were spoken and were printed 'without any re-writing or polishing'. In 1614 the little book was 'taught to speak English', and published in London. Three of the predecessors of Professor Torrance in the Systematic Theology chair at New College, Cunningham, Laidlaw, and H. R. Mackintosh, have been faithful to their duty of reviving interest in one who was 'deemed worthy to stand in the shoes of John Knox'. Robert Bruce spoke the Word of God to the whole nation in the year of the Spanish Armada, 1588. But the whole of Dr Torrance's Introduction (pp.13-36) is of rare interest. The sermons are searching and probing, and go deep. The word 'heart' seems to be used with the same meanings as it has in writings two centuries later. It is by no means as compendious as *kardia* in the New Testament. According to the *Greek-English Lexicon* (Arndt and Gingrich), it is used as the 'centre and source of the whole inner life with its thinking, feeling, and volition, in the case of the natural man, as well as the redeemed man'. This use persisted, at least as far as the writings of the Wesleys', especially the Sermons, and beyond that in the Methodist published sermons of the early nineteenth century. In the sermons of Robert Bruce there is one clear instance of 'feeling flowing from knowledge in the mind' (p.142). But, like John Wesley, Robert Bruce keeps mere feeling in its place. A striking instance of this is on p.95: 'You must be born again of the Spirit and His Spirit shall quicken you. . . . What does this Spirit do as soon as He comes into us? He chases away darkness out of our understanding.' This is interpreted as meaning: 'Now I know, I see, that He is God in Christ. . . . He opens the heart as well as the mind. Those things on which I bestowed the affection of my heart and employed the love of my soul, are now, by the working of the Holy Spirit, made gall to me. . . . This is a great Perfection,' says Bruce, describing the 'inward disposition', 'but nevertheless in some measure He makes me love God more than anything else. But although the substance of our hearts and minds is not changed, they are made new to such an extent that we are called a new creation. Unless we are new creatures, we are not in Christ. This secret conjunction, then, is brought about by faith and the

Holy Spirit.' It is not John Wesley who is preaching! It is Robert Bruce. So once again the answer is verified which John Wesley gave to his preachers on 2nd August 1745: 'Does not the truth of the gospel lie very near both to Calvinism and Antinomianism?' Answer: 'Indeed it does: as it were, within a hair's-breadth.'

Vocation and Ministry, by F. R. Barry (Nisbet, 12s. 6d.). The Bishop of Southwell has written a book about the present critical position of the Church of England. 'To-day the ministry', he says, 'despite some welcome relative improvement in the last few years in the number of Ordinations, is, nevertheless, just dying on its feet. That ought to be said bluntly and emphatically before we proceed any further on this enquiry' (p.62). At a time when we have been engaged with official 'conversations' with representatives of Anglicanism, we do well to take sympathetic notice of this book. And is it possible that Anglicans might be helped by us, as we should certainly learn from them? Meantime, we should take notice that during the war (1944) a report on *Training for the Ministry* was issued recommending certain reforms. The whole trend of this report was, indeed, 'Back to the universities.' Practically nothing has been done about it—except that one or two steps have been taken in precisely the opposite direction. But the whole book should be read, lest the picture be distorted.

The Protestant Ministry, by Daniel Jenkins (Faber, 12s. 6d.). 'The ministry is the great ecumenical problem, because it is in the ministry that the promise and the difficulty of the movement are both localized.' The author writes all his eight chapters on this text. The first five chapters ('The Protestant Ministry Today') form the first division of the book, and the second division, with three chapters (pp.117-192), is headed 'The Inner Life of the Minister'. The second chapter calls us to consider what is the primary human reality in the Church of God. That is not the ministry, but the common life of the People of God. He points out that one of the most misleading implications of the Catholic doctrine of Apostolic succession is the assumption that the only successors of the Apostles are the ministers of the Church. But if the Apostles represent the twelve tribes of Israel, all who belong to the New Israel share in that succession. The rich catalogues of spiritual gifts bear witness that continuity is to be maintained not by one class of ministry alone, but by all. 'Remember your leaders . . . imitate their faith.' The third chapter, 'Protestant Thoughts on Episcopacy', puts our ecumenical dilemma in a fresh light. The characteristic mark of a ministry is indeed faithfulness to the Apostolic testimony, and a ceaseless effort to stand in the succession of the Apostles in proclaiming Christ to mankind. The remaining chapters are equally valuable, especially the fifth, on 'The Minister's Place in Society', which contains more than one golden paragraph (e.g. pp.103-4) of wisdom and insight which would be singled out by anyone brought up in manse or vicarages. The second main division of the book again brings us to 'The Inner Life of the Minister' by a rarely frequented pathway. The sixth chapter is called 'The Theatron', a description borrowed from St Paul (1 Cor. 4^o): 'The Minister is the one man among all men who cannot be permitted the luxury of a sheltered life'. The seventh chapter is called 'The Man of Faith', and the last is 'Orthodoxy and Heresy: the temptations of the Ministry'. Incidentally, although our author is fascinated by Kierkegaard, he also sees the greatness and relevance of Schleiermacher. I hope that younger ministers will read and buy this book. But it must be read twice before you can see how good it is.

Power in Preaching, by W. E. Sangster (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). There is no better guide in the pilgrimage of the preacher than Dr Sangster. His earlier books, *The Approach to Preaching* and *The Craft of the Sermon*, are justly famous. The seven short chapters in this, the third volume in the trilogy, are given titles in the imperative mood: 'Believe in It', 'Keep to Centralities', 'Work at It', 'Make It Plain', 'Make It Practical', 'Glow over It', 'Steep It in Prayer'. The fifth chapter ends with the

sentence: 'The normal sermon will end with down-to-earth, practical things, and those who are serious in the pursuit of holiness will know the next steps they have to take.'

Anglicanism, by Stephen Neill (Penguin Books, 5s.). What is this strange, world-wide body called the Anglican Communion? How did it come to be what it is? What does it stand for among the many Christian bodies that together make up the Christian world? What is it that makes it work today? These four questions have been forced upon Bishop Neill as he has lectured to Continental audiences, in his work towards Christian union. This book is his answer. It is a fascinating answer, in fifteen chapters. The second takes us forthwith into the sixteenth century, but into pastures new. 'What is often overlooked is that the Reformation is part of the laymen's revolution.' The author points to the choice in 1529 of Sir Thomas More as Chancellor of the Kingdom as a sign of the change in the times. He was the first layman to be appointed, the forerunner of the modern Prime Minister; and as the medieval man, willing to give his life in opposition to the changes in religion, he became the ancestor of the modern Roman Catholic saints and martyrs. On the other side of the picture, Bishop Neill is fair to Henry VIII. He invokes the verdict of one of the most learned of English historians, E. A. Freeman, who wrote that Henry had no thought of setting up a new Church, but simply of reforming the existing English Church (p.39). The revision of age-long judgements proceeds apace as we read. On almost every page there is something refreshing. The Authorized Version was never 'authorized'; but it was 'appointed to be read in Churches' (p.134). Special note (pp.119-200) is taken of William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury (1716-37), who is suddenly appearing in his proper place as one of the greatest Churchmen of his time. We owe this rehabilitation to the Dixie Professor in Cambridge, Dr Norman Sykes, but Bishop Neill also does justice to Wake. The troublous days of the nineteenth century are given two chapters, but that does not cover the expansion in the English-speaking world. It has been the glory of Anglicanism to have taken the lead in the ecumenical movement—especially in the realm of Faith and Order: 'By the time of the Edinburgh World Conference (1937), William Temple had revealed himself as the greatest ecumenical personality of this age.' There is an ample bibliography (pp.445-58), which succeeds in its aim, and in which every student can find guidance for his next step.

Church Membership in the Methodist Tradition, by Frederick A. Norwood (New York, The Methodist Publishing House, via Epworth Bookshop, \$2.75). The leaders of our fellow Methodists in the U.S.A. have been disturbed by the problem of 'maintaining quality of faith in the midst of quantitative growth'. The proposed Quadrennial Programme puts first the need for 'concerted concentration on improving the quality of Christian experience and Christlike living of all our ministers and members'. Dr Norwood, the Professor of Church History in the Garrett Biblical Institute at Evanston, had written this book before official action was taken, and he found that it might have been written for such a time as this. The chapters are entitled 'Getting In', 'Staying in', 'Putting Out'. The book is an historical study leading up to the conclusion that 'the recovery of discipline will bring the Church again to the narrow gate and the straight way which the Master said would lead to life'. I should add to this conclusion that we who are Methodist ministers in Great Britain have discovered in the movement called 'The Fellowship of the Kingdom' the way forward. When faced by a similar situation, we found that groups of ministers, young and old, meeting monthly, and coming together for the inside of a week in the summer, was the practical solution to our problem.

Sermons for Special Occasions, by C. H. Spurgeon (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 15s.). This is the first volume of a re-issue of the great preacher's work. Dr Sangster's book (reviewed above) can be used at once. What is the secret of the continuing power

in the sermons of Spurgeon? He believed passionately in the message of the Cross of Christ. He always kept to the central themes. He worked hard at the message, 'gazing at the Cross', as Sir Robertson Nicholl said, 'till he had almost gazed his eyes away'. He made it plain. He made it practical. There is a hidden art in his apparent simplicities. Take, for example, the Good Friday sermon, on 'Immeasurable Love' (John 3₁₆). Christ is offered on every one of the fourteen pages. 'What is it to perish?' he asks as he is nearing the end of a closely argued sermon. 'It is to lose all hope in Christ, all trust in God, all light in life, all peace in death, all joy, all bliss, all union with God. This shall never happen to thee if thou believest in Christ'. If sometimes you are confronted with a theory of substitution which you think you have outgrown you may be sure that Spurgeon saw infinitely more in the gospel of Christ Crucified than that theory, and it is at pains to say so. Witness the sermon 'Gladness for sadness', for Memorial Day (pp.87-100). Congratulations are due to the publishers on this first volume of the new issue. Two more volumes are to be published this year, one containing sermons on the parables, and the other on the miracles.

Documents on Christian Unity; Fourth Series, 1948-57, edited by G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester, 1929-58 (O.U.P. 21s., cloth; 10s. 6d., paper). A mere turning of the first five pages will give you proof of the world-wide impulse towards the unity of the Church of God today. Dr Bell's leadership has been incomparable throughout the last dozen years. But the majority of the people in our congregations know very little about it. Is it too much to expect their ministers to make up for their lack of knowledge? There are documents here from the Roman Catholic Church, the Eastern Orthodox, the Baptist Union, the Methodist Church, the Church of Scotland, the Scandinavian Churches, the leading Churches in the U.S.A. and Canada. There are outlines for the proposed schemes of Church Union in Nigeria and the Cameroons, Ceylon, North India, and Pakistan. There is a document expressing the hesitation of the Church of England in blessing the newly-formed Church of South India in 1947; and there is the much happier document in July 1955 unanimously agreeing, 'both on theological grounds and in the light of the further development of the Church of South India', to acknowledge 'bishops, presbyters and deacons, as true bishops, presbyters and deacons in the Church of God'. This was passed unanimously by both Houses in the Convocations of Canterbury and York.

Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? The Witness of the New Testament, by Oscar Cullmann (Epworth Press, 6s.). This little book contains the Ingersoll Lecture, which was delivered in Andover Chapel for the University of Harvard. It comes to us with honourable scars, the marks of unexpected warfare: 'No other publication of mine has provoked such enthusiasm or such violent hostility.' The book begins with this sentence on its first page. I fear that the critics cannot have read the book with understanding of the great gap which separates biblical doctrine from Platonic doctrine, Socrates from the martyred Stephen and St Paul. This speaks pathetically for the Christian education in our time. 'Jesus, as He faces the last enemy, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews, wept and cried in the face of death. There is Socrates, calmly and composedly speaking of the immortality of the soul.' Why this contrast? But you must read this lecture to find out. Or, if you are fortunate enough to possess Professor Leonard Hodgson's volume renewed in our July number, you will see the question in the right perspective.

Letters to My Son, by Dagobert D. Runes (Philosophical Library, New York, via Epworth Bookshop, \$2.75). The review of this author's *Book of Contemplation* in our April number has produced a call for a notice of the earlier book. It is dedicated to 'My Mother, Victim of Teutonic Fury'. We can too easily guess at the tragedy which lies behind that dedication. But Christians ought not to forget that the racial hatred which produces anti-Semitism and colour prejudice is still fiercely alive. Like the

sower going forth to sow, the author throws out by the wayside some wise words about prison-reform, the most neglected issue of our age. I fear the birds will devour them. The book ends strangely: 'It is what we do to others, or fail to do for others, that matters. What we do with ourselves is no one's business but our own. I wonder if even God cares. Only nature has a right to punish the self-indulgence in man, and Nature does.'

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The International Review of Missions, April 1958.

- A Report on Ghana Group Discussion, by Gwenth Hubble.
- The Christian Mission in Asia Today, by U. Kyaw Than.
- Changes in the Patterns of Western Missions, by W. Freytag.
- The Christian Encounter with Buddhism in Burma, by Hla Bu.
- 'Evangelicals' and W.C.C.-I.M.C., by Norman Goodall.

The International Review of Missions, July 1958.

- The All Africa Church Conference: Ibadan, Nigeria: January, 1958, by L. B. Greaves.
- The Contribution of African Culture to Christian Worship, by J. H. Nketia.
- The Missionary Appeal Today, by Douglas Webster.
- Christian Responsibility in the Population Problem, by John B. Wyon.
- The Legions of the Ignorant, by H. D. Northfield.
- 'Men and Women in Africa Today.' A Consultation: Ibadan, Nigeria, by Betty Hares.

Studies in Philology, April 1958.

- Erasmus and the Apologetic Textbook: A Study of the *De Duplici Copia Verborum ac Rerum*, by J. K. Sowards. John Fisher and the Scholastics, by Edward S. J. Surtz.

The Yale Review, Summer 1958.

- Morality, Moralism, and Diplomacy, by Dean Acheson.
- The Great Soviet Encyclopedia, by William Benton.

Interpretation, April 1958.

- A Chapter on the Church—The Body of Christ, by Markus Barth.
- The Church Reformed According to the Word of God, by Lester J. Kuyper.
- Kingdom, Family, Temple, and Body, by Theophilus Mills Taylor.
- The Bible and Modern Religions, The Theosophical Cults, by Leslie Bullock.

Theology Today, April 1958.

- The Christian Mission at This Hour, by John A. Mackay.
 - Review of Tillich's *Systematic Theology*, Vol. II, by George S. Hendry.
 - Review by William Lee Miller of *Faith and Ethics: The Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr*.
 - Review by Hugo Adam Bedau of *Faith and Knowledge: Oxford Essays in Philosophical Theology*, Edited by Basil Mitchell.
 - The Byzantine Church and the Presentness of the Past, by Glanville Downey.
-

bout
hem.
that
er if
and

res.

rum,

uhr.
nical

out
m.
nat
r if
and

s.
m,

hr.
cal

Our Contributors

D. SHERWIN BAILEY
A.C.I.I., PH.D.

In business, 1918-40; Lincoln Theological College, 1940-2. Publications: *The Mystery of Love and Marriage*; *Sponsors at Baptism and Confirmation*; *Thomas Becon and the Reformation of the Church in England*, etc.

RUFERT E. DAVIES
M.A., B.D.

Tutor in Church History and the History of Christian Doctrine at Didsbury College, Bristol. For twelve years Chaplain of Kingswood School. Assistant Secretary of the World Methodist Committee of the Methodist Conference of Great Britain. Author of *The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers* and co-Editor of *The Catholicity of Protestantism*.

LAURENCE W. GRENSTED,
M.A., D.D.

One-time Vice-Principal, and then Principal, of Egerton Hall; Army Chaplain for five years. Returned to Oxford and was Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion from 1930-50, specializing in the psychology of Religion.

D. ALAN KEIGHLEY
M.A., B.D.

Read Economics at Cambridge. Has held a pastorate in N.E. London and is now Secretary of the Social Responsibility Department, and joint-Secretary of the International Department, British Council of Churches.

G. W. H. LAMPE
M.A., D.D.

Formerly Fellow and Tutor of St John's College, Oxford; Edward Cadbury Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham since 1953 and Vice-Principal of the University since 1957. Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Birmingham, Peterborough and Wakefield. Honorary Canon of Birmingham Cathedral.

A. MARCUS WARD
M.A., D.D.

Methodist minister. Missionary in S. India, 1932-55. Member of Joint Committee on Church Union; and of C.S.I. Synod and Theological, Liturgical Committees. Author of *The Pilgrim Church*, etc.

FRANK BAKER
B.A., B.D., PH.D.

Methodist minister. Registrar of the Wesley Historical Society and Secretary of the Methodist Historical Society. Awarded first prize Eayrs Essay in 1948 for *The Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism*. Author of *A Charge to Keep* and other works.

DONALD J. BOYS
B.D., PH.D.

Methodist minister. Studied Hebrew and Aramaic at Leeds University and gained his Doctorate for his thesis, *A Translation of the Samaritan Liturgy for Shabuot*.

G. THOMPSON BRAKE

Minister of Halstead Baptist Church, Essex. Contributor to the religious and secular Press.

R. NEWTON FLEW
M.A., D.D.

Moderator of Free Church Federal Council, 1945-6. President, Methodist Conference 1946-7. Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, 1937-55. Author and Editor of various important theological books.

JOHN FOSTER
M.A., D.D.

Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity in the University of Glasgow.

DEREK STANFORD
F.R.S.L.

Studied Law, but renounced it for Literature. Interested in the relationship between literature, criticism, and theology. Contributor to many journals. Author of books on Christopher Fry, Dylan Thomas and Emily Brontë.

WESLEY F. SWIFT

Methodist minister. Editor of *Proceedings* of Wesley Historical Society since 1948. Awarded Fellowship in Methodist History by World Methodist Council at Lake Junaluska, 1956. Author of *Methodism in Scotland*, *The Ministers' and Laymen's Handbook*, etc.

NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

ARTHUR SAMUEL PEAKE, 1865-1929

Essays in Commemoration

Edited by John T. Wilkinson, M.A., B.D., F.R.Hist.S.

The name of Peake will be revered for a long time to come by successive generations of men whom he trained for the Ministry, among whom the stories are endless of the brilliance of his teaching. But Dr Peake laid the whole religious world in his debt by his books and articles in the learned journals. His *Commentary* continues its usefulness among all classes of preachers and students.

21s. net

THE FAITH OF A METHODIST

The Fernley-Hartley Lecture, 1958

By Eric Baker, M.A., Ph.D., D.D.

This year's lecture represents an avowed attempt by a leading Methodist scholar and statesman to 'reach the ordinary man in the pew—and the street.' Dr Baker claims, as did John Wesley himself, that 'the faith of a Methodist' is—just plain Christianity. He has been at pains to express himself, as is his wont, with clarity and simplicity.

8s. 6d. net

SPEECH IN THE PULPIT

*By Paul E. Sangster, M.A. (Speech and Drama),
Gold Medallist L.A.M.D.A.*

It is a conviction of the author that when a man is deep in his Bible, clear in his doctrine; skilful in the craft of sermon-construction, he can still fail as a preacher because of inattention to his voice. This is a 'Must' book for young preachers . . . and plenty of those who are not so young, too.

8s. 6d. net

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF THE HEREAFTER

By C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

The series of works by Dr Ryder Smith on various Bible doctrines is well known and widely used. Shortly before his death he completed the typescript of this, the last, of them. In its general approach it resembles its predecessors, and in its qualities of careful scholarship and balanced judgment is worthy of a place beside them.

30s. net

JOHN WESLEY AMONG THE PHYSICIANS

By A. Wesley Hill, B.A., M.B.

John Wesley was interested in literally everything, as readers of his journal will know. His interest in medicine, however, was one of his leading characteristics, and in this sphere, as in so many others, he was years—even generations—ahead of his time.

10s. 6d. net

POWER IN PREACHING

By W. E. Sangster, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D.

This book completes Dr Sangster's trilogy on Preaching. *The Approach to Preaching* (5s.) leads the way into the subject: *The Craft of the Sermon* (10s. 6d.) deals with making the sermon, and now *Power in Preaching* discloses some of the secrets of influence in the pulpit and may be said to crown the author's work on this theme.

7s. 6d. net

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

